

FBIS

DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Middle East & North Africa

Vol V No 39

27 February 1978

INTER-ARAB AFFAIRS

Abu Iyad Denounces As-Sadat, Supports Kiprianou [VOP]
Palestinian Team in Cyprus To Follow Investigation

A 1 1/A6
A 1 1/A6

ARABIAN PENINSULA

OMAN

Military Operations Carried Out Against Iranians

C 1 1/A7

SAUDI ARABIA

Fighting Reported Between Saudi Arabia, PDRY

C 1 1/A7

YEMEN--PDRY

Agreement To Be Signed With Bulgarian Party

C 2 1/A8

YEMEN--YAR

Al-Ghashmi Inaugurates New People's Assembly

C 3 1/A9

EGYPT

As-Sadat Grants Interview to OCTOBER Magazine

D 1 1/A10

President as-Sadat Receives Atherton in Ismailia

D 8 1/B3

Official Sees 'Encouraging Beginning'

D 8 1/B3

Declaration of Principles

D 9 1/B4

Kamil Receives U.S. Ambassador

D 9 1/B4

AL-AHRAM Sees Difficult Task

D 9 1/B4

Foreign Minister Receives Jordanian Ambassador

D 10 1/B5

Egyptian Ambassador to Cyprus Returns to Cairo

D 10 1/B5

Cyprus Ambassador Leaves

D 10 1/B5

Britain To Look After Interests

D 10 1/B5

Shock Force Commander Shukri Grants Interview

D 11 1/B6

General al-Jamasi Visits Larnaca Wounded

D 14 1/B9

Karamanlis Cables As-Sadat on Ties With Cyprus

D 14 1/B9

Plan To Assassinate As-Siba'i Killers Reported

D 14 1/B9

Recognition of Denktas Reportedly Proposed

D 15 1/B10

Source Says Egypt Will Not Give Bases to Any State

D 15 1/B10

Press Rejects TASS Allegations

D 15 1/B10

JORDAN

Premier Outlines Conditions for Joining in Talks	F	1	1/B12
Baghdad: Jordan Ready To Join in Talks	F	1	1/B12
British Foreign Secretary Owen Arrives in Amman	F	1	1/B12
Gives Address on Mideast	F	2	1/B13
Departs Amman 26 Feb	F	3	1/B14
AD-DUSTUR Replies to Dayan's Remarks on Jordan	F	3	1/B14

LEBANON

INA on Statement Issued by PDRY, Nationalist Movement	G	1	1/C1
Baghdad Reports on Fighting, Junblatt Interview	G	1	1/C1
Lebanese Officers Reportedly To Face Trial	G	1	1/C1
INA: Cyprus Fears Further As-Sadat Reaction	G	2	1/C2
Officials Meet, Discuss Efforts for Reconciliation	G	2	1/C2
JANA: Sarkis-Al-Asad Summit in Early March	G	2	1/C2

SYRIA

TISHRIN Says Syria Declines To Receive Atherton	H	1	1/C3
ATH-ATHAWRAH Praises Soviet-Syrian Statement	H	1	1/C3
Military Delegation Expected To Leave for Moscow	H	3	1/C5
Deputy Premier Receives Soviet Charge d'Affaires	H	3	1/C5
ICATU Official Claims Maltreatment in Cairo	H	3	1/C5

NORTH AFRICA

ALGERIA

EL MOU'JAHID Comments on Egypt's 'Tarnished' Policy [21 Feb 78]	I	1	1/C6
---	---	---	------

LIBYA

JANA on Larnaca Incident, As-Sadat's Reaction	I	2	1/C7
Al-Qadhdhafi Warns Against Interfering in Africa	I	3	1/C8
JANA: Chad, Libya To Restore Diplomatic Relations	I	3	1/C8
Jallud Returns Following 2-Day Visit to Turkey	I	3	1/C8
Niger, Chad Presidents Leave Following Talks	I	3	1/C8

TUNISIA

Nouira Opens Meeting With General Union of Labor	I	3	1/C8
Hedi Nouira Gives Speech at UGTT Conference	I	4	1/C9
UGTT Executive Bureau, Secretary General Elected	I	5	1/C10
Approves Amendments to Basic Statute	I	6	1/C11
Interior Ministry Lifts State of Emergency	I	6	1/C11

ISRAEL

Cabinet Sees No Need to Change Settlements Policy	N	1	1/C12
Official Announcement	N	1	1/C12
Further Details of Session	N	1	1/C12

Labor Party Reaction	N	2	1/C13
Peres Comments	N	2	1/C13
Jerusalem POST Interpretation [27 Feb 78]	N	2	1/C13
Other Press Reaction	N	4	1/D1
Dayan Interviewed on Egypt Talks, Settlements	N	5	1/D2
Dinitz Interviewed on U.S.-Israeli Ties, U.S. Attitude	N	9	1/D6
Foreign Minister Dayan Meets With Atherton	N	11	1/D8
Counterproposals to Egyptians Given to Atherton	N	12	1/D9
Dayan, UK Minister Owen Speak at Banquet	N	12	1/D9

SOUTH ASIA

INDIA

Vietnamese Prime Minister Addresses Parliament	S	1	1/D10
Speaks at Delhi Banquet	S	4	1/D13
Begins Talks With Desai	S	6	1/E1
Formal Talks Concluded	S	6	1/E1

MAP 1 0 1978

Item 85618-6 Pr Ex 710: FBIS-MEA-78-39

FBIS-MEA-78-39

Monday

27 February 1978

Vol V No 39

COMPLETED
DAILY REPORT

ORIGINAL

**MIDDLE EAST &
NORTH AFRICA**

Available for Distribution

From NTIS

FBIS

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

This publication contains current news and commentary monitored by FBIS from foreign broadcasts, news agency transmissions, newspapers, and periodicals. Items are processed from the first or best available source; it should not be inferred that they have been disseminated only in the medium, in the language, or to the area indicated. Items from foreign-language sources are translated by FBIS. Those from English-language sources are transcribed, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by FBIS. Labels such as [Text] or [Excerpts] in the first line of each item indicate how FBIS processed the information from the original. Names rendered phonetically or in transliteration are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clearly heard but have been supplied as appropriate to the context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by the source.

Users of this publication may cite FBIS provided they do so in a manner clearly identifying it as the secondary source. For example: "FBIS reports that Radio Moscow announced . . ." or "FEIS has monitored a broadcast from Hanoi which says . . ."

ABU IYAD DENOUNCES AS-SADAT, SUPPORTS KIPRIANOU

JN231706Y Voice of Palestine [Clandestine] in Arabic to Arab World 1515 GMT 23 Feb 78 JN

[Text] In reply to the convulsive statements made by President as-Sadat yesterday, brother Abu Iyad, Fatah Central Committee member, has made the following statement: [read by announcer]

First, I do not know why As-Sadat threatened the Palestinians in this base manner--a manner which displays the collapse and the state of irresponsibility characterizing As-Sadat ever since his futile initiative.

Second, if he was referring to the Cyprus operation, did As-Sadat forget that the PLO vehemently condemned the operation and even dispatched a force to save the hostages? Why, then, is he instigating the Egyptians against the Palestinians and Palestine. Is not this deviation a part of the Egyptian regime's disavowal of the Palestinian cause and a prelude to carrying out a separate deal under the cover of its partner in reserve in the forthcoming settlement, King Husayn?

Third, regarding As-Sadat's talk about cabarets and night life, I believe that Anis Mansur or Musa Sabri [Egyptian journalists] could have resorted to this cheap manner, but I did not believe that As-Sadat, who is aware of the whimsical persons in his regime, could have talked in such way.

Fourth, as for threatening the Palestinians to strike tenfold for onefold and fiftyfold for fivefold [words indistinct].

Fifth, we declare our full support for President Kiprianou and the friendly Cypriot people, who have always supported the various issues of justice and right. We consider the action carried out by President Kiprianou to have been in defense of the sovereignty of his country and the dignity of his people--something which As-Sadat tried to harm through his acrobatic actions and statements which constitute a blatant violation of international principles. These statements and actions are also against the independence, unity and sovereignty of Cyprus and constitute a serious precedence in the area of relations among countries.

PALESTINIAN TEAM IN CYPRUS TO FOLLOW INVESTIGATION

NC250827Y Doha QNA in Arabic 0805 GMT 25 Feb 78 NC

[Text] Kuwait, 25 February--Quoting Palestinian sources in Beirut, the Kuwaiti newspaper AL-WATAN reports that a Palestinian security delegation has arrived in Cyprus to follow up on the investigation the Cyprus security services are conducting with those responsible for the murder of AAPSO Secretary General Yusuf as-Siba'i.

The paper says that PLO Executive Committee Chairman Yasir 'Arafat personally asked Cyprus President Kiprianou that Cyprus justice take its course in punishing the defendants, to the extent of execution. The paper says that the PLO has withdrawn a request which it had made to the Cyprus authorities to take custody of the defendants so they could be tried according to the organization's laws following the recent bloody developments which took place at Larnaca airport.

OMAN

MILITARY OPERATIONS CARRIED OUT AGAINST IRANIANS

LD261954Y Aden Voice of Oman in Arabic 1545 GMT 26 Feb 78 LD/EA

[Text] Brothers: On the 20th and 21st of this month one of the engineer units of the People's Liberation Army [PLA] operating in the northern part of the western sector of the southern region of Oman, Dhufar, carried out two military operations against the colonialist and Iranian invading forces, which are controlling our country and subjecting our Omani people to all forms of coercion and enslavement.

The PLA forces have issued a military communique in which they affirm the determination of the Oman revolutionaries to continue pursuing the goal of the revolution and to stand steadfast against our Arab nations enemies, who are bent on damaging its honor and dignity. Our revolutionaries succeeded in destroying two military vehicles and wounding or killing 11 of the enemy. The text of the military communique says: On 20/1/78 at 0930 an antivehicle landmine exploded under a Bedford military vehicle full of soldiers as a convoy of enemy vehicles was moving along the main line north of the western sector. On the second day, the 21st of this month, while the same convoy was on its way back along the same line, another landmine exploded under a Land Rover at 0800. The PLA forces estimated the enemy losses in the two operations as follows: wounding or killing of 12 [as heard] enemy and complete destruction of two vehicles. The engineer unit of the PLA forces returned to its base safely, vowing to continue the revolutionary war until the homeland is liberated and united. Fraternal and friendly newspapers and agencies have carried this military communique, describing it as a decisive and public reply to the lies of the agent Qabus regime and those of his foreign masters and protectors.

The experience of our courageous revolution in Oman and its militant march have proved important facts, including the fact that imperialism regards this area with great attention, considering it as the most important area, specially after having been chased out by the people of Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos. It has also proved that the treachery of the ruling dynasty in Muscat has no limits and that Qabus is more treacherous and more loyal and obedient to the English than any of his forefathers. The Qabus regime is incapable of facing up to the revolution without the protection of external forces. But the truth is that the Omani people are the hero and any people, however small, are not afraid of the great powers, neither imperialist nor reactionary, and are able to defeat them. This fact is stronger than the might and brutality of the enemies. Thanks to the steadfastness of its militants in the front lines facing the forces of invasion and occupation, to those in prison cells and places of detention and to those in every position of the revolution, this 8 June revolution will surely continue its march until the final victory is won.

SAUDI ARABIA

FIGHTING REPORTED BETWEEN SAUDI ARABIA, PDRY

NC261042Y Paris AFP in English 1028 GMT 26 Feb 78 NC

[Text] Teheran, Feb 26 (AFP)--Fierce fighting has broken out between Saudi forces and South Yemenites in the Rub'al Khali Desert in the south of Saudi Arabia bordering South Yemen, LE JOURNAL DE TEHERAN said here today.

The newspaper said armored vehicles and aircraft were involved in the conflict in which South Yemen forces had held the advantage. It added that the situation in Oman's border province with South Yemen, Dhofar, where subversion had been subdued by Iranian forces, had again become worrying.

Meanwhile observers here said that Iran and Saudi Arabia might center their answer to Soviet expansion in Ethiopia on South Yemen where Aden's transformation into a powerful communist base was concerning the two conservative countries. Reliable sources said there were three reasons for this change of objective. The joint Iranian-Saudi approach to the United States for energetic action on the Horn of Africa had not achieved anything. Riyadh and Teheran, who warned Ethiopia they would "react" to an attack against Somalia, have put a certain faith in Ethiopia's assurances that it does not plan to invade. Finally, there is strong tension on the Saudi-Yemen borders.

Sources here said that Saudi-Iranian efforts to halt communist progression in the south of the peninsula has two prerequisites. The two countries have to define their respective roles and interests, and Iraq must agree to be neutral. Iranian-Iraqi links currently are on a good basis. General Gholam Reza Azhari, Iranian chief of staff, received a rapturous welcome on his recent visit to Iraq. But South Yemen is seeking Iraqi "progressive" solidarity, and expert observers believe Baghdad is hesitating between taking up existing Marxist options and its desire to maintain the region's independence in the long-term.

Observers said that today's visit to Baghdad by the Iranian Foreign Minister Abas Ali Khalatbari would enable him to sound out Iraq on its reactions to the Aden aspects of a new turn in the Ethiopian-Somalian conflict.

YEMEN-PDRY

AGREEMENT TO BE SIGNED WITH BULGARIAN PARTY

LD262005Y Aden Domestic Service in Arabic 1630 GMT 26 Feb 78 LD

[Text] The United Political Organization-National Front [UPONF] and the Bulgarian Communist Party have agreed to sign a bilateral agreement to foster the development of party relations in the interests of their friendly peoples and their common goals against imperialism and Zionism and their allies. This took place this morning during the talks between the UPONF delegation, led by brother Muhammad Salih Muti', politburo member and foreign minister, and the Bulgarian Communist Party delegation, led by Comrade Ivan Prumov, secretary of the party's Central Committee.

The two sides exchanged views on relations between the two friendly parties and countries and also on current international developments. It is reported that their views are in agreement on the developments in the Horn of Africa and the Middle East.

Those taking part in the talks on behalf of UPONF were: brothers Salim Salih Muhammad, Central Committee member and external relations secretary of the Central Committee Secretariat; Said (Bakhazanah) of the organizing department of the Central Committee Secretariat; and 'Abdallah Abud, head of the socialist countries department at the Foreign Ministry. The Bulgarian Communist Party was represented by the members of the delegation and comrade [name indistinct], ambassador of the People's Republic of Bulgaria in Aden.

The Bulgarian Communist Party delegation arrived in Aden yesterday for a visit to the PDRY to last several days in response to an invitation from UPONF.

YEMEN-YAR

AL-GHASHMI INAUGURATES NEW PEOPLE'S ASSEMBLY

JN251625 [Editorial report JN] San'a' domestic service in Arabic at 1200 GMT on 25 February carries a report on the inauguration this morning of the newly formed People's Constituent Assembly in the YAR, including a 27-minute recording of the speech delivered by Lt Col Ahmad Husayn al-Ghashmi, the chairman of the YAR Command Council, on this occasion.

Al-Ghashmi begins his speech by congratulating the Yemeni people "on the return of democracy to public life" and describes the inauguration of the assembly as a historic memorable event in the history of Yemen. Addressing the assembly members, Al-Ghashmi says: The success of this democratic experiment depends on all the devout citizens, but you in particular. "Although we have placed the responsibility for the success or failure of this experiment on you, this does not mean that we are absolving ourselves of this responsibility. Therefore, I would like to tell you on behalf of the Command Council and the Cabinet and also in my name that you will find every cooperation, response and support from us so that your esteemed assembly can carry out the tasks entrusted to it and perform the role required of it."

Al-Ghashmi then reviews the achievements of the 15 years since the 26 September 1962 revolution. He says, like all other revolutions in the world, the Yemeni revolution committed mistakes, "and the responsibility for them is borne by some of those who took over the leadership of this homeland." The 26 June 1974 corrective movement was carried out to correct the course of the revolution and to rectify those errors. Al-Ghashmi continues: The biggest error we, as the leadership, committed after the corrective movement was to dissolve the consultative assembly, thereby disrupting constitutional life in the country. Thus my whole concern since coming to power was to restore democracy so the fate of the country will be linked with the fate of individuals.

Al-Ghashmi discloses that he had the intention of holding free general elections first, but then it was decided to form the assembly without elections to save time. Al-Ghashmi pledges that free elections will be held once the assembly has drafted the electoral law. Concluding, Al-Ghashmi calls on the assembly members to place the country's interests above all other considerations and he reassures them of the government's cooperation. The radio reports that, following the speech by Al-Ghashmi, Bahjat at-Talhuni, the speaker of the Jordanian Senate and president of the Arab Parliamentary Union, delivered a speech in which he conveyed to the Yemeni people the greetings of His Majesty King Husayn and the Jordanian people. He also conveyed the congratulations of the Arab Parliamentary Union to the Yemeni people on the inauguration of their new assembly.

The radio says that then the deputy speaker of the UAE National Assembly delivered a speech in which he conveyed the greetings of Shaykh Zayid ibn Sultan and the UAE people to Chairman al-Ghashmi and the Yemeni people.

Next, according to the radio, Al-Qadi 'Abdallah as-Simahi, who is the eldest assembly member and who had chaired the meeting, thanked the YAR Command Council Chairman Lt Col Ahmad Husayn al-Ghashmi on behalf of the assembly. The radio noted that the opening session was attended by the prime minister, the ministers, several friendly delegations and members of the foreign diplomatic corps in San'a'. The report concluded with the announcement that the assembly elected Al-Qadi 'Abd al-Karim al-'Arashi as speaker by 79 out of 86 votes.

AS-SADAT GRANTS INTERVIEW TO OCTOBER MAGAZINE

NC251201Y Cairo MENA in Arabic 1030 GMT 25 Feb 78 NC

[Text] Cairo, 25 February--In an interview with the magazine OCTOBER to be published tomorrow, as part of a series of interviews about the states which oppose the supply of U.S. arms to Egypt, President Anwar as-Sadat explains that the Soviets wanted to make the military aid to Syria an example of the relations between them and the Middle Eastern states. Before, during and after the October war, the Soviets showered the state that is antagonistic toward Egypt and follows them in every direction with tanks and aircraft.

President as-Sadat said that the Soviets are generously giving Syria and other states weapons. The Soviets are not pleased with Egypt's stand because Egypt is still a free state and is trying to recover its territory and at the same time is helping other states to win their freedom. The Soviets are pleased with Syria's stand, which represents complete subservience to them and at the same time is hostile to Egypt.

The text of President Anwar as-Sadat's interview with OCTOBER magazine follows:

Question: In a U.S. television interview which has not yet been telecast, you expressed your opinion on a number of political leaders in the world. Your opinion about three of them was similar. Your opinion was close to a feeling of grief and regret when you spoke about them, although your reasons and the tone of grief were different. The three are Presidents Nixon, Brezhnev and Hafiz al-Asad. What exactly are the reasons for this?

Answer: I actually did say that, to me, the three had a special place for very different reasons.

U.S. President Nixon was a friend and an honest man. He did not lie about anything and did not turn me down in any request I made. Therefore, the welcome the Egyptian people accorded him when he visited Cairo was extremely genuine. By his own admission, he had not seen anything like it in his life, and the East also had not witnessed anything like it. I was grieved by what happened to the man in his country and at the hands of his aides and of the U.S. press. I tried to contact him during my last visit to the United States but without success. But when I went to Munich, I contacted him and President Ford.

President Brezhnev is the only statesman among the Soviet leaders, and I can bear witness that he was the one who used to intervene to resolve the crises that often occurred between me and Podgornyy and Kosygin. Both of them are expert party politicians, or partisans, and I often disagreed with them strongly and sharply. Brezhnev was the one who was able to intervene at the appropriate time and resolve the disputes with sound intelligence and understanding. The Soviets judged the position correctly when they removed Podgornyy. He disturbed the serenity of any relations between the Soviets and Egypt. The Soviets will undoubtedly do the same with Ponomarev. He is the worst man there, the worst tool they use to convey incorrect information and rash judgments. His mistakes have been proven dozens of times in Egypt and elsewhere. One of his mistakes was that he expected a communist coup to overthrow me.

He was surprised to find that his agents 'Ali Sabri and company were put in jail. Brezhnev is still the best of them all. If relations with Egypt are restored to normal based on mutual respect, credit in this will go to this man, his wisdom and political shrewdness.

There remains Hafiz al-Asad. I am extremely sad about him. One does not have many friends in this world. Friends are so few in number but they can mean a great deal. One thousand friends can make the world shine with hope, love and loyalty. This is what our poets and wisemen keep telling us.

People did not understand my sadness at losing Jamal 'Abd an-Nasir. He was a lifelong friend, but the circumstances were hard on him and on us. Fate decreed that I should inherit his trouble and worries. People got mixed up and were not able to distinguish between my annoyance with the circumstances and my sadness at losing him. They did not know whether I was sad about him or about Egypt. However, my nature affirms every day that the best of all people is a true friend. Jamal 'Abd an-Nasir belonged to that unique type of leader.

I took Hafiz al-Asad as a friend. When differences increased between Egypt and the Syrian Ba'th Party, I was anxious to keep Hafiz al-Asad away from the circle of narrow party differences or from becoming partisan. The Syrian Ba'thists--had what they wanted but I did not have what I wanted most of the time.

For several years I kept differentiating between the Ba'th Party and Hafiz al-Asad. The reason was that I know Hafiz al-Asad and I know the difficult and twisted circumstances which push him in every direction and which govern his relationships and friendships. [passage indistinct]

For these reasons, I deeply pitied him after he shrank in size, after he lost stature and after his vision narrowed when he agreed to become a partisan and to shrink until he became a Ba'thist. No disgrace can befall a man like that which befell Hafiz al-Asad. It is an ugly picture for a dear friend to turn to the enemies' camp.

Question: Many reasons can be given to explain your attitude toward President Hafiz al-Asad, including a psychological explanation of relations among leaders. This psychological stand can rapidly turn into a national stand in view of the special ability of leaders to turn public opinion to accept their views. Can it be said that Hafiz al-Asad's psychological reasons have turned into national reasons, and thus this hostile attitude by the Ba'th Party and Hafiz al-Asad toward Egypt and As-Sadat?

Answer: The psychological explanation of events is an important factor in analyzing the situation, but it is not the only explanation. However, let me arrange the sequence of reasons and results very briefly and let historians and analysts find the introductions and conclusions they want. Let them put the relations between us in whatever light they want.

I first put the blame on the Ba'th Party. It is the source of all deliberate misunderstanding and rancor against Egypt. Some philosophers of this party keep playing on this theme and find in rancor that black well from which all the relations between the two countries have sprung for a long time.

I do not want to enter the labyrinth of history. What comes next to the Ba'ith Party's stand and its domination of everything in Syria is President Hafiz al-Asad's attitude. Many things happened during Jamal 'Abd an-Nasir's era to prove this.

The next very important factor is the Soviet Union, which has also been anxious to separate Egypt from Syria or to differentiate between Egypt and Syria, thus making the distance longer and the differences deeper. This means that the Soviet Union has exploited an existing rancor and added more serious dimensions to it.

If we arrive at this result, it is not strange after all for President Hafiz al-Asad's attitude to be indifferent or hostile. I can add other numerous and good reasons, but because of the way I view people, relations and things, I do not like to burn all the bridges, or to cut all threads or to lock all doors.

What I have said is enough. The rest I know and Hafiz al-Asad knows. I do not like to look at him and at what was between us in the past that will not return.

Question: Some say that in order to balance their relations with Syria and Egypt, the Soviets tried to apply a rule which they used in many countries and which also succeeded in the Middle East. This rule is: Give the arms to those who cannot fight and do not give them to those who can. Was it on the basis of this rule that the Soviets compensated Syria's losses and withheld compensation from Egypt at the most crucial times before, during and after the October war?

Answer: There is no harm in acknowledging that this rule applies sometimes, but this makes it necessary for me to go back a little to the attitude of the Soviets toward the two countries, how they gave generously to Syria and how they deliberately withheld all arms and spare parts from Egypt. It is a well-known story and therefore repetitious, but, in the psychological and strategic context, it assumes a new and different significance. On Saturday, 8 July 1972, we received a message from our embassy in Moscow to the effect that President Hafiz al-Asad would arrive in Cairo the following day. I did not know that he was on a secret visit to Moscow and assumed that something important had prompted him to go there secretly and that he would also stop over in Cairo.

That was in the summer and I was in Cairo. After the 1967 setback I decided not to go to Alexandria because I could not bear to go to a summer resort and swim and relax while the morale of the people and the armed forces was at such a low ebb. The defeat tore us apart physically and mentally. Everything seemed black, with little hope. Everything had a bitter taste. Our only aim was revenge.

Hafiz al-Asad came and I met him. On the way to Al-Qubbah Palace, I asked him: is all well?

[He answered] Well, God willing.

[I said] I did not know that you were in Moscow until we got this message from our embassy.

[He said] I have just concluded an arms deal with the Soviets, a great deal.

[I said] Congratulations on this deal, and congratulations to us too because every weapon you get adds to my strength. What is yours is mine. Any weapon you obtain is a weapon for Egypt received by Syrian hands.

[He answered] I am perfectly aware of this.

[I said] Hafiz.

[He said] Yes.

[I said] For your information, I summoned the Soviet ambassador yesterday and gave him 10 days, effective yesterday, to have all the Soviet experts out of Egypt. This decision is final.

[He said] What about this deal they promised me?

[I said] Nothing. Go ahead with your relations with the Soviets, see this deal through and do not get involved in this dispute between the Soviets and me. It is a crisis of misunderstanding and will end somehow. The Soviets need double the time necessary to understand any position, and more time to absorb it, and still more time to respond to it. Then they need much more time to rectify their wrong attitudes. I know this method of theirs, so I will play the game of patience and self-restraint with them. There is no need for you to become involved and thus lose the deal and the arms which Egypt has failed to get even 1 percent of.

[He said] It is not only the arms deal. There is also the project for building the Euphrates Dam.

[I said] This makes me even happier and I wish you succeed.

Hafiz al-Asad returned to his country.

At first the Soviets did not believe that I was serious about expelling 15,000 experts in 1 week. Their ambassador in Cairo told them: This is an Egyptian political maneuver and agitation. They believed him and did not believe me. I tried to couch the decision to expel them in diplomatic terms so that it would be less painful. I suggested to them that we issue a joint statement to the effect that their mission had ended and that their departure was by agreement and with the approval of both sides. The Soviets, however, insisted that the statement be issued by us and that we draft it any way we liked. The Soviets asked only that the departure be from a military airport. Their request was granted and they left 1 full day ahead of schedule.

Thus, the operation which pained and embarrassed the Soviets throughout the world ended. The story is well known. It marked the end of the road of pain that I had to go through alone, supported by our armed forces and by all the Egyptian people. I had endured a great deal of personal insult and national humiliation, and I had tried to find an excuse for the Soviets. The only excuse I could find was that they neither understood me nor tried to understand me. All their calculations were based on the fact that I was not their man. This was true, but they built many illusory and fictitious things on it.

I had visited Moscow four times but I did not have any indication that there was any intention to return the visit, although they did inform me that Brezhnev would visit Egypt.

I visited Moscow the fourth time at their strong insistence. I knew why. This happened before the expulsion of the experts. One reason for the visit was that they wanted to tell the Americans that they were there in the Middle East and in Egypt in particular. A date had been fixed for Nixon's visit.

Although I knew that this was a reason and that my visit was only intended as a demonstration of Soviet influence in the area, I agreed and I saw in it some kind of flexibility. This is putting it mildly. The correct description would have been that it was a continuation of personal humiliation for the sake of obtaining arms.

It was strange, before and after this, that arms should be stockpiled in Syria, and in Israel, too. As far as Israel was concerned it was understandable and logical because of the very special relationship between the United States and Israel--a relationship which the United States renews during all elections and before all elections. It was originally a legitimate relationship between a mother and her baby who has never been weaned.

What is happening in Syria is strange. Hafiz al-Asad personally told me early in 1972 that he did not know where to put the Soviet arms because they were so abundant that he neither knew where to store nor when to absorb them. While the Syrian Army is overfed, the Egyptian Army is suffering from military famine. This confirms the fixed position of the Soviets: to give Syria and not to give Egypt, for the reasons that I have mentioned.

Question: Afterward the Soviet behavior changed. They promised Egypt an arms deal and they actually sent the arms as quickly as possible. You yourself admitted that that was the first time that the Soviets had kept a promise. Did the Soviets not need encouragement from Egypt so they would continue to pursue this new policy?

Answer: This did happen. However, the motives were different. The Soviets announced that they wanted a meeting with the then war minister, Lt Gen Ahmad Isma'il. It was Ahmad Isma'il who had set up the line between Port Said and Suez after 1967, directed the Ra's al-'Jsh battle and sunk the destroyer Elat. Furthermore, he was a disciplined military man.

Ahmad Isma'il went to Moscow and told them the long story of our suffering in our relations with the Soviets. Indeed, they promised him that they would send arms. Half of the deal arrived as scheduled, even ahead of schedule. That was something surprising and unprecedented in all the deals between Egypt and (?the Soviet Union).

[Words indistinct] which it was impossible to encourage, because Ahmad Isma'il had studied in Moscow and was a friend of the chief [Soviet] expert in Egypt. Furthermore, he was a friend of (?Andropov), whom they were grooming to be Brezhnev's successor.

The Soviets thought they could make Ahmad Isma'il into their next man in Egypt. They had tried to do this with 'Abd al-Hakim 'Amir in Jamal 'Abd an-Nasir's days. However, they did not know Ahmad Isma'il well. First, he was an old friend. Second, he was a military man, not a politician. Therefore, they miscalculated when they entertained the illusion that Ahmad Isma'il would be the one to carry out for them a future communist coup in Egypt. The late Ahmad Isma'il told them frankly that he was a military man who had nothing to do with politics. But they misunderstood him, too. The deal they sent had to do with strengthening Ahmad Isma'il's position and trying to win him over to their side at the same time.

That deal was not for nothing, but Ahmad Isma'il did not encourage them in what they were doing. He even let them down. Therefore, they did not send over the remaining part of the deal. Even worse, they decided to turn it into "half a deal" while waiting for Ahmad Isma'il's response. In other words, they chose Ahmad Isma'il but he did not choose them. They chose him but, at the same time, they did not trust him.

Meanwhile, and until the outbreak of the October war, the Soviets lavished arms on Syria.

Question: Is it not strange that when there was such a strong, deep relationship between Egypt and Syria, that Syria--when the Soviets tried to crack this relationship--did not try to mediate to mend the crack and that Syria then took ambiguous stands during the October war, thus giving the impression that it had been colluding with the Soviets against Egypt?

Answer: This question answers itself. It so happened that in October 1972 I received a telegram from Hafiz al-Asad telling me that he was in Moscow and that he would pass through Cairo. It was not difficult for me to ascertain that the Soviets had sent for him to mediate between us and to convey to us the Soviets' request to meet with the Egyptian prime minister as well as a promise that Brezhnev would visit us around the beginning of 1973 in return for my four visits.

When Hafiz al-Asad went to Moscow, he had in his pocket a copy of the letter which I had sent to the Soviet leaders in August 1972, a copy of which I had also sent to President Boumedienne. The text of this letter is printed in full in my book "Looking for Oneself," which will be published in the United States at the end of March. However, what happened during the October war is one more of the riddles in Egyptian-Syrian relations and in Syrian-Soviet relations. Soviet Ambassador Vladimir Vinogradov communicated to me an urgent appeal to cease firing in response to Syria's request. I contacted Syria, but Syria dragged its feet for 24 hours before answering me, only to say later that nothing of the sort had happened and that it did not understand the lies that were being told about Syria. The Soviet ambassador then came to emphasize Syria's request. I affirmed to him that Hafiz al-Asad had totally denied making this request.

At the same time, we saw the Soviets permitting a larger number of Soviet emigrants to travel to Israel. Meanwhile, Israel sank a Soviet ship in Tartus harbor while a consignment of ammunition and arms for Syria was being unloaded. There were also reports that the Soviets were accusing Israel of a criminal act because this happened only 25 miles from Damascus.

It is no longer a military secret that Syria was out of the war by 8 October 1973--that is, 3 days after it began, while Egypt remained in it for 17 days, including 10 days of hot military confrontation with the United States. We shot down Israeli planes and later cut their tails off and discovered that they were from the United States and South Africa.

As an indication of what happened on the third day of the battle, it would suffice to recall what Moshe Dayan told the chief editors of the newspapers. He surprised them by saying: We now no longer have the power to throw the Egyptians into the Suez Canal without the complete destruction of our forces. If we do it we will lose all our army and Israel will be without an army. As for southern Sinai, the entire way is completely open to Abu Rudays, and I doubt our forces' ability to close this big gap. I declare now to the whole world that we are not longer as strong as the Egyptians.

Dayan also said that he would make a statement to this effect to the public in the 2300 newscast. Golda Meir, however, prevented him from making such a statement. Dayan also said at the time--although he now disclaims many of his emotional outbursts during the war--that he regained his spirit only when his forces were 25 miles from Damascus. Hafiz al-Asad told me--and he must have told other Arab leaders--that he lost 1,200 tanks in 1 day. The Soviets later replaced this great loss. They even issued orders to Iraq and the latter sent tanks to help Syria.

Hafiz al-Asad tried to involve King Husayn. I advised King Husayn not to get involved and only to send his forces to help Syria. He sent an armored brigade.

So this was the picture. The Soviets compensated Hafiz al-Asad for every loss and much more. Iraq and Jordan also helped him.

Before the cease-fire on 22 October, Syria had more arms and ammunition than it needed, and none of that for Egypt. Nobody needs to exert a great mental effort to draw the conclusion as to what this persistent discrimination in dealings meant. I still say that if I had had only one armored brigade, the whole picture of the war would have completely changed. This is a fact known to the military men. Military seminars held in Israel, Britain and the United States have commented on this statement and have agreed with me on it.

This state of affairs went on until my initiative for peace in the Middle East came about. This initiative created a strange situation in Syria. It is imperative for political thinkers to wonder what can be done to achieve a just peace in the Middle East and what is impossible.

Furthermore, (how can) the land be liberated while the Soviet Union and the United States are imposing an arms embargo on Egypt? If the Soviets deny arms to all the Arab states, then this would become an overall embargo on the area. At the same time, how can the Soviets agree that this embargo be imposed when there are the enormous and lavish U.S. supplies to Israel? However, the Soviets lavishly supply Syria and others, and for different reasons. Therefore, they give or sell arms. Furthermore, Egypt is still a free state and it is trying to recover its territory. Meanwhile, Egypt is helping many states achieve their freedom.

The Soviets are dissatisfied with Egypt's attitude. Therefore, what satisfies the Soviets? What inevitably satisfies them is the Syrian stand--one of complete subservience to the Soviets, coupled with animosity to Egypt.

However, it is imperative for the U.S. stand to change in the wake of my peaceful initiative. As I have already said, it is unreasonable that we should come under the Soviet embargo and the U.S. embargo at the same time. True, Egypt has found the means to procure arms from various sources. But it is illogical that the United States should be a party to the guarantees for peace in the area while it continues to escalate preparations for fighting and encourages Israel to carry out, or threaten, aggression.

The thing which is possible in this situation is for us to break the ice which led to the fait accompli being imposed on us, we the Arabs. The fait accompli is an impotent capitulation--and we are not impotent and we must not be so. We must move the whole situation moving in an organized and comprehensive way.

Although we are advocates of peace, Arabs or non-Arabs, some Arab viewpoints and the extremist viewpoints in Israel have drawn closer to an extent which makes one imagine that there is something similar to an agreement to impede the peaceful efforts so that there will be no peace, and then only the war trumpets will continue to sound and the arms trade will continue to flourish. Is this not something saddening and regrettable?

PRESIDENT AS-SADAT RECEIVES ATHERTON IN ISMAILIA

NC241322Y Cairo Domestic Service in Arabic 1230 GMT 24 Feb 78 NO

[Text] President Muhammad Anwar as-Sadat received U.S. Assistant Secretary of State Alfred Atherton in Ismailia this afternoon. The meeting was attended by Foreign Minister Muhammad Ibrahim Kamil and U.S. Ambassador in Cairo Hermann Eilts.

The radio reporter has learned that the meeting dealt with the latest developments in the Middle East situation. The U.S. assistant secretary of state also conveyed to President Anwar as-Sadat the outcome of his talks with Israeli Prime Minister Begin and other Israeli officials concerning the declaration of principles for a comprehensive settlement of the Middle East crisis.

Foreign Minister Muhammad Ibrahim Kamil resumed his talks with Alfred Atherton during a working luncheon the foreign minister gave for Mr Atherton. The luncheon was attended by Minister of State for Foreign Affairs Dr Butrus Ghali and U.S. Ambassador in Cairo Hermann Eilts.

Mr Atherton will leave Cairo for Jerusalem this evening within the framework of his current tour, during which he will be contacting the two sides with a view to reaching agreement on a declaration of principles for a comprehensive settlement of the Middle East crisis.

Official Sees 'Encouraging Beginning'

NC242000Y Cairo Domestic Service in Arabic 1830 GMT 24 Feb 78 NO

[Text] Alfred Atherton, U.S. assistant secretary of state, left Cairo this evening at the conclusion of his discussions in Cairo. In a statement to the radio correspondent, Foreign Ministry Under Secretary Dr Usamah al-Baz said: We are at the outset of the road and this is an encouraging beginning.

He added that the present tour of the U.S. assistant secretary of state is just one move within the general context of the efforts being exerted to get the situation moving. Al-Baz said: This works in our favor because moving the situation means getting nearer to the Arab demands, the latter being summed up in withdrawal from the occupied Arab territories and recognizing the Palestinian people's right to determine their own fate and set up their homeland.

Al-Baz said: The objective of these talks is to achieve a declaration of principles by which we hope to fulfill our national aspirations. Concluding his statement, his excellency said he hopes more of the parties concerned will join in the talks because this action would strengthen the Arab position and make it possible to achieve the rights of the Arabs on the various fronts. The radio correspondent has learned that Alfred Atherton will return to Cairo next Tuesday.

Declaration of Principles

NC242219Y Cairo MENA in Arabic 2211 GMT 24 Feb 78 NC

[Text] Cairo, 24 February--The newspaper AL-AHRAM reports Saturday that Israel has not yet submitted specific written proposals on the proposed declaration of principles for peace in the area. The paper says that Israel proposed instead the early resumption of the work of the Political and Military committees even before there is a declaration of principles, although Israel has not made this proposal in writing.

Kamil Receives U.S. Ambassador

NC251440Y Cairo MENA in Arabic 1355 GMT 25 Feb 78 NC

[Text] Cairo, 25 February--Foreign Minister Muhammad Ibrahim Kamil today met with the U.S. ambassador in Cairo, Hermann Eilts. It has been learned that they discussed international questions of concern to the two countries, particularly the recent incidents in Cyprus and the Horn of Africa. They also discussed current developments in the Middle East related to the mission of the assistant secretary for Near Eastern and South Asian affairs, Alfred Atherton, and his shuttle between Egypt and Israel connected with the declaration of principles for the sake of achieving an overall settlement in the Middle East.

AL-AHRAM Sees Difficult Task

NC251108Y Cairo MENA in Arabic 0640 GMT 25 Feb 78 NC

[Excerpts] Cairo, 25 February--Cairo newspapers today highlight U.S. Assistant Secretary of State Alfred Atherton's talks in Cairo, which ended yesterday, within the framework of his current tour in the Middle East.

The newspapers say in banner headlines that Egypt has given Atherton specific proposals on the declaration of principles to take with him to Israel. They also highlight President as-Sadat's assertion to Atherton that peace depends on Israel's withdrawal from the occupied Arab territories and the achievement of the Palestinian people's rights.

Commenting on U.S. Assistant Secretary of State Alfred Atherton's current mission between Egypt and Israel in support of the peace efforts in the Middle East, AL-AHRAM says: Atherton is facing a difficult task. Egypt fully realizes this just as it realizes the seriousness of the mission he is carrying out in his capacity as representative of the United States.

The newspaper says: Atherton's task is difficult and complicated mainly because he is facing an Egyptian stand based on UN resolutions and the principles of human rights. Above all, it is based on demands on which no one can compromise, demands which call for an end to occupation, the liberation of Arab territories and the restoration of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people.

AL-AHRAM adds: All these firm and internationally recognized Egyptian stands are countered by a long list of Israeli demands that sometimes talk about security and peace and other times talk about Israel's right to exist and to be recognized, while the Israeli Government acts as if, and officially announces, that it wants both the land and peace at the same time.

AL-AHRAM stresses that Egypt will not miss any opportunity to support the efforts aimed at establishing a just and permanent peace. Egypt will continue to adhere to its strategy based on the restoration of all the occupied Arab territories, including Jerusalem, and the need to institute full sovereignty for all the states of the area on their territories. It is now up to the other side to define its stand and make up its mind.

Concluding its comment, AL-AHRAM says: The U.S. envoy is called upon to translate the U.S. stands declared by President Carter into a working plan that will restore peace and stability to the area and that will show that the greatest power on earth is always on the side of the world community's resolutions, which are based on justice.

FOREIGN MINISTER RECEIVES JORDANIAN AMBASSADOR

NC261590Y Cairo Domestic Service in Arabic 1500 GMT 26 Feb 78 NC

[Text] Foreign Minister Muhammad Ibrahim Kamil met with the Jordanian ambassador in Cairo today. They exchanged points of view on the Arab situation and the developments of the Middle East crisis in view of the mission which U.S. Assistant Secretary for Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs Alfred Atherton is undertaking in the countries of the Middle Eastern area.

EGYPTIAN AMBASSADOR TO CYPRUS RETURNS TO CAIRO

NC270625Y Cairo Domestic Service in Arabic 0500 GMT 27 Feb 78 NC

[Text] Egyptian Ambassador to Cyprus Hasan Shash returned to Cairo at 0200 today. Following his arrival he said he will submit a full report on the Larnaca airport incident to Foreign Minister Muhammad Ibrahim Kamil. Ambassador Shash added that all the embassy staff members have returned to Cairo except the military attache, who stayed behind to look after two wounded soldiers, whose conditions are satisfactory. The two wounded soldiers will return to Cairo shortly. The first secretary at the embassy also stayed behind.

The ambassador offered condolences on behalf of the embassy staff to the family of martyr Yusuf as-Siba'i and the families of the martyrs of the shock forces and the air force. The ambassador concluded his statement by saying that the Cyprus people are deeply affected by what happened. This confirms that relations between the two peoples are excellent and that what happened was against the will of the Cyprus people.

Cyprus Ambassador Leaves

NC260858Y Cairo MENA in Arabic 0842 GMT 26 Feb 78 NC

[Text] Cairo, 26 February--The ambassador of Cyprus, Andis Sotiriadhis, and the members of the embassy staff, left Cairo for Athens this morning en route to Cyprus, following the severance of relations with Cyprus. He was seen at the airport by Sharif 'Umar, minister plenipotentiary of the Foreign Ministry, and a number of foreign ambassadors.

Britain To Look After Interests

NC262058Y Cairo MENA in Arabic 2045 GMT 26 Feb 78 NC

[Text] Cairo, 26 February--MENA has learned that the British ambassador in Cairo, Willie Morris, met today with Minister of Foreign Affairs Muhammad Ibrahim Kamil and conveyed to him the Cyprus Government's request to have Britain look after its interests in Egypt.

The foreign minister conveyed to the British ambassador Egypt's approval. Foreign Minister Muhammad Ibrahim Kamil tonight received Greek Ambassador in Cairo Ioannis Yiannakakis. MENA has learned that the foreign minister told the Greek ambassador that Egypt would like Greece to look after Egyptian interests in Cyprus. The ambassador promised to convey this to his government.

SHOCK FORCE COMMANDER SHUKRI GRANTS INTERVIEW

NC241505Y Cairo Domestic Service in Arabic 1130 GMT 24 Feb 78 NC

[Interview granted by Maj Gen Nabil Shukri, commander of the Egyptian shock force which participated in the Larnaca airport operation, to Amal Fahmi of Cairo Radio in the "Round the Corner" program--recorded]

[Excerpts] [Question] Maj Gen Nabil Shukri, I do not like to say that this is going to be a long interview but we want to learn at least some of the details from Your Excellency. The assassination of martyr Yusuf as-Siba'i took place on 18 February. The operation you carried out took place on the following day. What time did the military plane take off?

[Answer] It was at 1700. His excellency the deputy prime minister, war minister and commander in chief of the armed forces had personally come to us at one of the airports and assigned me the task. The time was about 1615. At 1700 the plane actually left the airport.

[Question] How long did the trip last from point to point?

[Answer] It lasted 1 and 1/2 hours exactly.

[Question] Naturally, before landing, the airport control tower in Cyprus had to be contacted to identify the plane. Of course, the plane could not have possibly landed at the airport unless it had permission to do so.

[Answer] Naturally. The plane took off. The officials in Cyprus had an idea that a plane was heading for Cyprus. When the plane entered Cyprus airspace, it of course identified itself and was allowed to land. It landed at Larnaca airport at 1830.

[Question] Could anyone have made a mistake as to the military or civilian identity of the plane or was the plane clearly identifiable as a military plane?

[Answer] Of course, a military plane is different from a civilian plane. As the plane landed at the airport, all the responsible people could see very clearly that it was a military plane bearing the flag of Egypt. However, had we wanted to deceive them, we would have used other planes, civilian and not military planes.

[Question] Maj Gen Nabil Shukri, can you tell us how many men were assigned to the task?

[Answer] There were approximately 60 men, including officers, noncommissioned officers and soldiers, in addition to the 8 crew members.

[Question] For what type of operation were the weapons the men had with them intended?

[Answer] They were light weapons such as machineguns or pistols. However, I would like to bring up to a very important point which will make things clear because I have heard that we started the aggression against the Cyprus forces, or something of this sort. The facts are contrary to this because each task requires a special type of weapon. Had we wanted to attack the Cyprus forces, we would have been able to do so. We would have taken effective weapons with us with which we could have destroyed any forces attempting to oppose our operation. But because we were going to friends, or so we imagined, we took with us adequate weapons to rescue the plane and the hostages. They were all simple weapons, light weapons.

[Question] What was the original plan if the unexpected had not happened?

[Answer] The plan that we were to have used was very simple. You are aware that we had previously dealt with a hijacked plane in Luxor. The plane was rescued, thank God. There were 90 passengers of various nationalities aboard. Not a single drop of blood was shed. The same thing could have happened again. Not a single drop of blood would have been spilled. Proof of this is that when the group that was to storm the plane emerged and rushed toward the plane, we were, regrettably, treacherously stabbed in the back. Had the Cyprus authorities not intervened in a treacherous, treasonous and mean way, I believe that not a single drop of blood would have been shed in this operation. It could have been carried out even more quickly than the Luxor operation.

[Question] How far from the plane which contained the hostages and the terrorists was the military plane parked?

[Answer] It was parked about 500 to 600 meters from it.

[Question] Were the forces heading for the plane or did it seem from the storming operation that they were heading for the airport building?

[Answer] It was very clear to everybody there that I sent a limited force to rescue the plane. I sent about 12 men first. These men would have completed the operation, which did not require a large force. How could they imagine that 12 men were going to participate in or carry out a battle with forces of a state which we considered friendly?

[Question] In other words, the force which went to rescue the hostages did not include all the men who were aboard the military plane?

[Answer] No. We always divide the force into action groups. The first group consists of 8 to 12 men. We were sure that it was a simple and easy operation which these men could carry out to rescue the hostages.

[Question] Were the hostages actually saved by the shock force heroes?

[Answer] Of course. I emphasize this point. This is a very important point because I have heard that some radios have had doubts about this. No, I emphasize that we stormed the plane--because my men had reached the steps of the plane and went up them. When the terrorists discovered that we were going to arrest them, they came out and surrendered. They came out together with the hostages and asked for a cease-fire in order to surrender.

[Question] I would like to ask about the Cyprus force which was deployed at the airport and which opened fire on our heroes while they were discharging their duty. Was it normal for such a force to be present in that part of the airport at that specific time?

[Answer] Of course not. It was not normal at all. I would like to tell you that we did not notice that there were armored vehicles at the airport because they were hiding them. We thought that we could cooperate to save the hostages, and by doing this to enhance the reputation of all international society through cooperation in a noble cause, that is, striking at terrorism and exterminating it. Regrettably, they began to use machineguns mounted on armored vehicles against us at a time when we came to help them.

[Question] As Your Excellency just pointed out, the fact that the Cyprus forces were hidden in such away as to surprise our forces is proof that there was lack of good will. As Your Excellency has just said, all the world is fighting terrorism. We have before us examples from sisterly Somalia, which welcomed the German forces which landed at Mogadiscio airport to rescue the hostages from the hijacked airliner. It was assumed that there should be cooperation and assistance, not fighting as happened.

May I ask Your Excellency about the points of similarity or the points of dissimilarity between the operation carried by the shock heroes with the participation of the air force at Larnaca airport and other similar operations which have taken place to save hostages, such as the Entebbe operation or the Mogadiscio operation?

[Answer] In fact, there is big difference. Of course, we agree that terrorism must be combated. No one condones terrorism and the entire world community condemns it.

As for the Mogadiscio operation, this is a clear example of one state welcoming another friendly force to combat terrorism. This happened with the German force which saved the hijacked airliner at Mogadiscio airport.

Regarding the Entebbe operation, it took the form of a military operation against an unfriendly state. The force that landed was big enough and sufficiently armed to wipe out any resistance standing in its way and to secure the return of the hostages. The Entebbe operation took place against an unfriendly state. I went on the basis that I would be cooperating with friends. Regrettably, the opposite occurred.

[Question] Maj Gen Nabil Shukri, fire was opened at the backs of the shock forces, the heroes who went to carry out this mission. How was the situation settled at that critical moment?

[Answer] In fact, these were very difficult moments. As I told you, our force had sped toward the gangway and actually reached it. We did not fire a single bullet at any Cypriot because we had one specific, clear and known task, which was to save the hostages with minimal losses. When our force reached the gangway of the airliner and was on the verge of succeeding in carrying out its task, fire was opened in a treacherous and treasonable way at the backs of our soldiers. Heavy firing then followed. After that, armored vehicles on which machineguns were mounted intervened. The Cyprus forces then began to fire antitank guns at our plane--as if they were engaged in a real battle!

In view of this, I had to act. I, accompanied by a group of colleagues, rushed to a nearby Cyprus airliner. I entered the airliner and held three Cypriots who were inside it as hostages. I began to negotiate with and address the officials concerned to stop these mad acts. Thank goodness, we succeeded in preventing a massacre which would have been even worse than what happened.

GENERAL AL-JAMASI VISITS LARNACA WOUNDED

NC241606Y Cairo Domestic Service in Arabic 1500 GMT 24 Feb 78 NC

[Text] Gen. Muhammad 'Abd al-Ghani al-Jamasi, deputy prime minister and minister of war and war production, accompanied by Lt Gen Muhammad 'Ali Fahmi, armed forces chief of staff, visited the heroic men of the shock and air forces who were wounded during the operations at Larnaca airport in Cyprus.

In a statement General al-Jamasi affirmed that the fighters of the Egyptian armed forces have total confidence in their homeland and are determined to achieve the national tasks that might be entrusted to them. General al-Jamasi expressed delight at the high morale of the wounded victims of the treacherous aggression to which they were subjected in Cyprus last Sunday.

The deputy prime minister and war minister asked the wounded how they felt and wished them a speedy recovery. He also thanked them for the spirit of heroism and sacrifice epitomized in the Larnaca operation. He also presented them with commemorative gifts.

Armed Forces Chief of Staff Lt Gen Muhammad 'Ali Fahmi stated that during his visit to the wounded he sensed the stamina and loyalty of the fighters and their readiness to carry out any similar tasks with which they might be entrusted with the same stamina for Egypt's sake.

KARAMANLIS CARLES AS-SADAT ON TIES WITH CYPRUS

LD250020Y Cairo MENA in Arabic 2232 GMT 23 Feb 78 LD

[Text] Cairo, 23 February--In tomorrow's issue AL-AHRAM reports that Greek Prime Minister Konstandinos Karamanlis has sent a long message to President Anwar as-Sadat emphasizing the importance of strengthening Egyptian-Greek relations and Egypt's relations with Cyprus. In his message Karamanlis also points to the need to overcome all difficulties and problems for the sake of the people of the area. He also spoke of his desire to settle the crisis between Egypt and Cyprus.

PLAN TO ASSASSINATE AS-SIBA'I KILLERS REPORTED

NC250840Y Cairo MENA in Arabic 0627 GMT 25 Feb 78 NC

[Text] Cairo, 25 February--The newspaper AKHBAR AL-YAWM reports today that the Egyptian authorities have officially informed the Cyprus Government that they have information that there is a plan to assassinate the two killers of martyr Yusuf as-Siba'i. The newspaper says this information was confirmed after the Cyprus authorities failed to spirit out the two killers and hand them to the PLO. The Cyprus authorities were compelled to arrest the killers after the Egyptian commando force stormed the commandeered airplane, freed the hostages and arrested the killers.

The newspaper says Egypt has warned that there is a plan to assassinate the two killers during the investigation or while they are being transported from the prison to the court, with the aim of silencing the killers and concealing the hands and circles which masterminded, financed and perpetrated the crime.

V. 27 Feb 78

D 15

EGYPT

RECOGNITION OF DENKTAS REPORTEDLY PROPOSED

NC251552Y Cairo DPA in Arabic 1520 GMT 25 Feb 78 NC

[Text] Cairo, 25 February--The newspaper AKHBAR AL-YAWM today reports that some Arab states have proposed the recognition of the Turkish Cypriot republic headed by Rauf Denktas following Egypt's withdrawal of its recognition of Spiros Kiprianou. The paper, however, did not list these states by name.

Egyptian Vice President Husni Mubarak said last night on arriving home from Morocco that the Moroccan authorities will define their attitude toward Nicosia in light of how the Cypriot authorities respond to the Egyptian demands for handing over the two Palestinians who assassinated Egyptian writer Yusuf as-Siba'i.

Egyptian writers have rejected the Cyprus Government's objection to surrendering the two terrorists on the basis that there were political motives behind the crime. Egyptian lawyers say the crimes of terrorism and assassination cannot be lumped together with political crimes even if there was a political aim involved. The lawyers cite the provisions of the Geneva agreements on fighting terrorism.

Meanwhile, the Cairo newspaper AKHBAR AL-YAWM anticipates that Egypt's withdrawal of its recognition of Kiprianou as president of Cyprus will create a serious crisis which will possibly force Kiprianou to resign.

SOURCE SAYS EGYPT WILL NOT GIVE BASES TO ANY STATE

NC260646Y Cairo MENA in Arabic 0636 GMT 26 Feb 78 NC

[Text] Cairo, 26 February--An Egyptian authoritative source has affirmed that Egypt is not prepared to give military bases to any state and that Egypt turned down a Soviet request for a base in Marsa Matruh and another Soviet request for naval facilities at Egyptian ports. In a statement published by the newspaper AL-JUMHURIYAH today, the source stressed that the United States has not asked for any bases in Egypt because it is well aware of the Egyptian position and that only the Soviet Union makes such requests.

Press Rejects TASS Allegations

NC260857Y Cairo MENA in Arabic 0638 GMT 26 Feb 78 NC

[Excerpts] Cairo, 26 February--AL-AHRAM and AL-AKHBAR comment on the lies carried by TASS with the aim of defaming Egypt, claiming that the U.S. Government is at present considering the possibility of setting up a U.S. airbase in the Sinai Peninsula, which is now under Israeli occupation. AL-AHRAM begins its editorial by asserting that Egypt is too big and too clean for any attempt by any power whatsoever to defame it through lies. It adds: As for Egypt's policy in general, Moscow knows very well that Egypt has only one face in dealing with the entire world and that there is nothing but clarity in its policy toward the world. One of the most important features of Egypt's policy is, as has clearly been demonstrated, its refusal to be under anyone's trusteeship.

The paper continues: regarding Egypt's position on the question of bases on its territory, Moscow knows that Egypt is not a state which gives bases to anyone. What is even more important is that Moscow knows better than anyone else that Egypt turned down a request by a big power for permission to have a base in Marsa Matruh and later rejected another request by the same big power for naval facilities at Egyptian ports. In conclusion AL-AHRAM says: Moscow knows this very well and it knows the state whose requests were turned down by Egypt, because this state is the Soviet Union itself. Once again we say that if Moscow cannot say anything about Egypt except lies, would it not be better to remain silent?

AL-AKHBAR attacks the claim made by the Soviet news agency TASS that the United States is at present considering setting up an airbase in the Sinai Peninsula to insure Israel's security. It says that by carrying such an item, the Soviet agency means to defame not the United States or Israel but Egypt and to accuse Egypt of coming to an agreement with or of subservience to the United States. The paper adds: It is very clear that by carrying this report, the Soviet agency wants to tell people that Egypt, while rejecting the continued presence of Israeli settlements and airfields in Sinai, has agreed to the building of a U.S. airbase, meaning that it has substituted U.S. occupation for Israeli occupation to guarantee Israel's security.

AL-AKHBAR points out that Moscow, in whose name the Soviet agency speaks, knows perfectly well that Egypt has categorically rejected military bases and pacts since the emergence of the policy of bases and pacts and that Egypt rejects this policy not only for Egypt but also for all the states in the Arab region and all the other states struggling for freedom and independence. In its commentary AL-AKHBAR says that Moscow and its political propaganda trumpets know better than anyone else that Egypt strongly and resolutely rejected the Baghdad Pact and what Eisenhower called the plan to fill the military vacuum in the Middle East. Egypt shouldered the burden of struggle, fighting and vicious economic blockade and stood upright in the face of all the heavy pressure and did not submit.

The paper adds: Moscow is well aware of this and knows that Egypt was the country which struggled against military bases in Libya and Cyprus and in all the African and Asian countries. And Egypt still maintains this position, struggling against any military bases in the Red Sea area. The paper says that if Moscow wants to remember and if the Soviet propaganda trumpets want to tell the truth for once, they should tell the world that it was the Soviet Union alone that asked Egypt to establish a naval base for its fleet in Marsa Matruh and Egypt refused and that it was the Soviet Union that tried to use its military experts to control and dominate our army and our will, and Egypt rejected this attempt and President Anwar as-Sadat made his bold decision to expel these experts from Egypt.

AL-AKHBAR says: Instead of carrying its feeble report, TASS should have told the people the truth about the statements made by communist and Syrian sources to the effect that Moscow has agreed with Al-Asad to link Syria with the Warsaw Pact. Is this report true? Concluding its commentary, AL-AKHBAR says: The Soviet propaganda trumpets, however, do not like to tell the truth, even once. They are used to following the method of distortion, altering the truth and spreading lies.

PREMIER OUTLINES CONDITIONS FOR JOINING IN TALKS

JN261247Y Amman Domestic Service in Arabic 1200 GMT 26 Feb 78 JN

[Text] Prime Minister Mudar Badran has said that Jordan is ready to participate in the current Middle East negotiations if two conditions are met: Israel's announcement of its intent to withdraw completely from all the occupied Arab territories and the insurance of the national rights of the Palestinian people on their soil.

In an interview published by the Kuwaiti newspaper AR-RA'Y Al-'AMM, the prime minister affirmed Jordan's rejection of Begin's plan for self-rule in the West Bank and of any solution which does not lead to the ending of Israeli occupation of the Arab territories.

On Jordanian-Syrian relations, Badran said that these relations are good. He affirmed that coordination between the two fraternal countries on all levels is based on firm foundations and that nothing has happened to harm this coordination which we consider a strategic objective between the two countries. He said: The bases of the Jordanian-Syrian relations are strong. The prime minister added that contacts between Jordan and the PLO are continuing.

BAGHDAD: JORDAN READY TO JOIN IN TALKS

JN250840Y Baghdad Voice of the Masses in Arabic 0800 GMT 25 Feb 78 JN

[Text] The Jordanian regime in Amman issued a statement last night in which it affirmed its readiness to participate in the [Egyptian-Israeli] negotiations when these reach an advanced stage and when the general principles for a settlement are announced. The statement was issued prior to the visit which Dr David Owen, British secretary of state for foreign and commonwealth affairs, is scheduled to make to Amman today. Owen and the Jordanian officials will discuss the Jordanian regime's role in the negotiations for a settlement and the expediting of Jordan's joining these negotiations. The British foreign secretary will proceed to occupied Palestine tomorrow to hold talks with the racist Zionists on the negotiations regarding a settlement in the region.

BRITISH FOREIGN SECRETARY OWEN ARRIVES IN AMMAN

JN251025Y Amman JNA in Arabic 0950 GMT 25 Feb 78 JN

[Text] Amman, 25 February--British foreign secretary David Owen arrived in Amman this morning on a 1-day visit to Jordan, during which he will meet Regent and Crown Prince His Highness Prince Hasan and a number of officials. Owen told journalists that during his visit he will hold talks on relations between Britain and Jordan, with emphasis on the basis for a just and permanent peace in the Middle East. He said that all parties in the area have a desire to reach a solution to the problem.

In his statement Dr Owen referred to the EEC's role in finding a solution to the Middle East problem. He also referred to the EEC's resolutions, which provide for recognition of the Palestinian people's rights and the need for their participation in the talks, and recognition of secure borders for all the countries of the area.

Owen also pointed to the main role the United States is playing to solve the Middle East problem. He spoke of Britain's role in solving this problem as a friend to the two parties to the conflict. He said that he held talks with His Majesty King Husayn in Britain on several topics.

Dr Owen pointed out the transformation that has occurred in the Middle East crisis since President As-Sadat's visit to Israel. He said that if this initiative is not taken advantage of to achieve peace, the peace moves will get bogged down and the historic chance for peace will be lost. He expressed hope for the possibility of reaching a peaceful settlement in the Middle East. Owen lauded the friendly relations linking Jordan and Britain, and the role played by Jordan in finding a settlement to the Middle East crisis.

Minister of State for Foreign Affairs Hasan Ibrahim welcomed Dr Owen on his visit to Jordan, which will be a new step toward strengthening existing relations between the two countries. He expressed the hope that the talks will be fruitful and useful in bringing about success for the peace efforts aimed at finding a just and overall settlement in the Middle East. He stressed the role Britain will play in the Middle East crisis. He said Britain can play a very useful and important role to help reach a just and permanent solution to the problem.

In addition to the minister of state for foreign affairs, the governor of Amman, the dean of the Diplomatic Corps, the British ambassador in Amman and a number of Jordanian officials received Owen at Amman airport.

Gives Address on Mideast

JN252155Y Amman Domestic Service in Arabic 2100 GMT 25 Feb 78 JN

[Text] Dr David Owen, the British secretary of state for foreign and commonwealth affairs, tonight addressed the International Affairs Society in Amman. He presented the British Government's stand on the basic issues of the Middle East crisis. Dr Owen said that President As-Sadat's visit to Israel has broken the mold of thinking which was prevailing in the Middle East and presented a new course for the search for peace. It has also had a positive effect on world public opinion.

Dr Owen added: But it seems there is a gradual return to the old method of thinking, and this calls for action to prevent it from developing fully, because such thinking, which dominated the Middle East for a long time, was responsible for preventing a settlement in the past. Dr Owen said that the basic problem is to find a homeland for the Palestinians. He emphasized the legitimacy of this demand. Dr Owen said: Two problems are linked with this subject; the first is the nature of the Palestinian homeland and the second is the right of self-determination for the Palestinians. There are also the differences revolving around these two points which are linked with Israel's security concept. Speaking to the International Affairs Society, Dr Owen expressed his concern about the political language prevailing in the Middle East which, he said, emphasizes every word and letter uttered and on which the parties concerned base their stands. Dr Owen said: We must not bury the As-Sadat initiative but maintain its momentum. Dr Owen pointed out the need for moderate and rational leaders in the Arab world at this very time.

Dr Owen expressed the fear that matters might get worse in the Middle East if no settlement is reached. He also stressed Jordan's role in the building of peace because of its close link to the Middle East. After the address a dialog followed between Dr Owen and the members of the International Affairs Society on points made in the address and on the current developments of the Middle East question. The dialog was conducted by 'Adnan Abu 'Awdah, the vice chairman of the International Affairs Society.

Departs Amman 26 Feb

JN260946Y Amman JNA in Arabic 0935 GMT 26 Feb 78 JN

[Excerpt] Amman, 26 February--Dr David Owen, British secretary of state for foreign and commonwealth affairs, left Amman this morning following a 1-day visit to Jordan during which he met with His Highness Crown Prince Hasan the regent. He also held talks with Hasan Ibrahim, minister of state for foreign affairs, dealing with bilateral relations and the situation in the Middle East and the Horn of Africa.

AD-DUSTUR REPLIES TO DAYAN'S REMARKS ON JORDAN

JN250722Y Amman Domestic Service in Arabic 0515 GMT 25 Feb 78 JN

[From the press review]

[Excerpts] Under the headline "Jordan and Israel's Negativeness," the newspaper AD-DUSTUR reports: During his recent tour of the United States, Israeli Foreign Minister Moshe Dayan conspicuously focused on what he describes as the role which Jordan can play in making the current negotiations between Egypt and Israel to achieve peace in the Middle East a success. This attitude has been such that certain U.S. papers ironically began to wonder whether the Israeli minister was trying to put the blame on another party, namely Jordan, for the failure which Israel caused to President As-Sadat's initiative. Today's reports from occupied Jerusalem carry new statements by Moshe Dayan in which he says that As-Sadat has rejected an amended formula for a declaration of principles proposed by the United States because this formula will be rejected by Jordan. Thus Dayan is trying once again to hint that Jordan's tenacity is impeding current negotiations between Egypt and Israel.

The paper continues: We do not think that we need too much effort to refute this stupid charge with which Israel is trying to conceal its negative stand which is responsible for torpedoing As-Sadat's initiative. The entire world, including the U.S. administration, is frankly accusing Israel of intransigence, arrogance and wrecking peace efforts. Hiding behind Jordan or anybody else will not be of use to Israel since the real reasons--Israel's insistence on not withdrawing totally from Sinai and the West Bank, on establishing settlements in the occupied land and on refusing to recognize the Palestinians' right to self-determination--have become known. The paper adds: Jordan did not put conditions of its own but merely brought to mind the conditions contained in the UN resolutions, which Israel accepted in form and then made a subject of bargaining at the negotiating table. Jordan is not responsible for impeding the Israeli-Egyptian negotiations because it was not a party to these negotiations. The entire world blames Israel. Hence attempts to drag Jordan into the trap of negotiations will not succeed. The paper concludes: Let Israel save itself the trouble of blaming others for its actions. If it is serious in seeking genuine peace with the Arabs, all it has to do is respond to Egypt's demands, which sum up the demands of the Arabs, namely, clear commitment to total withdrawal from the Arab territories and respect of the Palestinians' right to free self-determination.

INA ON STATEMENT ISSUED BY PDRY, NATIONALIST MOVEMENT

JN241633Y Baghdad INA in Arabic 1600 GMT 24 Feb 78 JN

[Text] Beirut, 24 February--The Lebanese nationalist movement and the PDRY United Political Organization-National Front have called for exerting all efforts to achieve the unity of the Arab progressive and nationalist forces so as to thwart the imperialist-Zionist-reactionary plots and schemes and to put an end to the vicious onslaught being launched against the Arab liberation movement. This is stated in a joint statement released today in Beirut and Aden on the 18-23 February talks held by a delegation of the Lebanese nationalist movement in Aden. The statement also deals with the situation in Lebanon. It confirms the support of the United Political Organization for the struggle of the Lebanese people and their nationalist movement. The two sides expressed their principled and firm support for the Palestinian people and their armed revolution and for their right to build an independent national state on their land.

The nationalist movement delegation invited the United Political Organization to participate in the rally which will be held in Beirut in the middle of March on the occasion of the first anniversary of the martyrdom of struggler Kamal Junblatt.

BAGHDAD REPORTS ON FIGHTING, JUNBLATT INTERVIEW

JN251118Y Baghdad Voice of the Masses in Arabic 0800 GMT 25 Feb 78 JN

[Text] One element of the pro-Syrian As-Sa'iqa has been killed and four others wounded during a clash between the As-Sa'iqa elements and nationalist elements in the Ghubayrah quarter in west Beirut. The As-Sa'iqa elements were trying to enter the Al-Ghubayrah secondary school and impose one of their allies as principal of the school. The secondary school was closed indefinitely. Two secondary schools at Burj al-Barajinah in west Beirut were also closed 2 weeks ago after a similar incident. An RPG was fired yesterday at a hotel owned by a prominent member of the rightist National Liberal Party in Brummana in east Beirut, under the control of the rightist elements.

On another level, Walid Junblatt, leader of the Lebanese Progressive Socialist Party, has stated that the explosion of the situation in Lebanon seems to be inevitable in view of the current balances. In an interview with the magazine ATH-THAWRAH MUSTAMIRRAH [REVOLUTION CONTINUES] Junblatt excluded the possibility of reaching any agreement over national reconciliation in Lebanon within the current balance of power since the rightist side rejects the existence of nationalist forces. He explained that national reconciliation is subject to the return of the political and military balance among the various parties facilitating the grouping of all the national forces to face the schemes of the rightist front. Touching on the situation in southern Lebanon, Junblatt stressed that the Zionist enemy is trying to set up a buffer zone there as an outlet for any threat or blackmail against the Palestinian resistance and against the Arabs. On As-Sadat's capitulatory steps, he said that As-Sadat has gained nothing from his initiative. The internal situation in Egypt is ready for a new revolution of liberals.

LEBANESE OFFICERS REPORTEDLY TO FACE TRIAL

NC260916Y Doha QNA in Arabic 0808 GMT 26 Feb 78 NC

[Text] Doha, 26 February--Citing an authoritative source in the Arab deterrent forces operating in Lebanon, the Qatari newspaper AL-'ARAB says today that it has been decided to bring 14 Lebanese officers to trial on Saturday since it has been established that they were involved in the Al-Fayyadiyah barracks incident in eastern Beirut.

According to the source, strict security precautions will be taken at the trial. The same source says it has been proved that Antoine Barakat, commander of the Al-Fayyadiyah barracks, was behind the recent incidents in Lebanon and that Syria requested he be brought to trial as soon as his interrogation was completed. The isolationist leaders, however, have been trying to persuade the Syrian command and the Lebanese Army command not to bring him and other officers to trial and to be satisfied with just their dismissal from the army.

The source affirms that Syria has rejected this and that the government of President Sarkis has refused to cooperate in any way with those who triggered off the Al-Fayyadiyah incidents and the incidents which followed.

The source also affirms that the deterrent forces have rejected a request by the isolationists to remove the checkpoint near the Al-Fayyadiyah barracks.

INA: CYPRUS FEARS FURTHER AS-SADAT REACTION

JN241802Y Baghdad INA in Arabic 1725 GMT 24 Feb 78 JN

[Text] Beirut, 24 February--Lebanese President Ilyas Sarkis at noon today received Lebanese Ambassador to Cyprus Shaykh Munir Taqiy ad-Din. The ambassador submitted a report to President Sarkis on the situation in Cyprus following the recent events involving Cyprus and As-Sadat's regime.

It has been learned from well-informed sources here that the Cypriot government has expressed fears that As-Sadat may prevent ships flying the Cyprus flag from passing through the Suez Canal. The Cypriot Government also expressed fears that As-Sadat may attempt to impose pressure with the aim of harming Cypriot interests.

OFFICIALS MEET, DISCUSS EFFORTS FOR RECONCILIATION

JN250831Y Damascus Domestic Service in Arabic 0415 GMT 25 Feb 78 JN

[Text] Dr Salim al-Huss, Lebanese prime minister, and Kamil al-As'ad, president of the Chamber of Deputies, in a meeting held yesterday evening discussed the current situation in Lebanon, efforts being exerted to achieve national reconciliation and developments in the region. Radio Lebanon has reported that Dr al-Huss stated after the meeting that he discussed with Al-As'ad the initiatives proposed to reach the best solutions for the problem facing Lebanon, the question of national reconciliation and the subject of rebuilding the Lebanese Army.

JANA: SARKIS-AL-ASAD SUMMIT IN EARLY MARCH

LD270813Y Tripoli JANA in Arabic 0700 GMT 27 Feb 78 LD

[Text] Beirut, 27 February, JANA--It is almost certain now that Syrian President Hafiz al-Asad and Lebanese President Ilyas Sarkis will hold a summit conference in early March in Damascus, a JANA correspondent in Beirut reports, saying that the Lebanese defense minister will visit the Syrian capital within the next 2 days to prepare for President Sarkis' visit, which political sources in Lebanon say is extremely urgent.

Political circles in Lebanon say that discussions during the Syrian-Lebanese summit will cover a number of questions, including the extension of the term of the Arab deterrent forces, the conclusion of a security pact between the two countries and the situation in southern Lebanon in light of the current developments in the Middle East.

TISHRIN SAYS SYRIA DECLINES TO RECEIVE ATHERTON

JN270944Y Damascus SANA in Arabic 0855 GMT 27 Feb 78 JN

[Text] Damascus, 27 February--The newspaper TISHRIN carries a front-page report today that, according to available information, Alfred Atherton, envoy of U.S. President Carter to the Middle East, now on a shuttle mission between Egypt and Israel, has expressed the desire to visit Syria during his shuttle tours in the Middle East. The paper adds that Syria regrets that it cannot receive him as part of a tour which does not concern Syria in any way because it does not serve a just and lasting peace in the area.

The paper says that Syria previously rejected the U.S. wish to hold a high-level Syrian-U.S. meeting because it had nothing to say and because what it could say was known to the United States. There is no way to go back on or amend what has been said. The paper adds that Syria notes that the declared U.S. policy being pursued in the Middle East--a policy which provides for granting huge quantities of arms to Israel--does not serve peace in the area. The paper adds that Syria is anxious to achieve a just and lasting peace based on the withdrawal from all the occupied Arab territories and on enabling the Palestinian people to exercise their national rights. Thus, Syria is not concerned with Atherton's moves because they do not serve the just peace which Syria insists on.

ATH-THAWRAH PRAISES SOVIET-SYRIAN STATEMENT

JN251103Y Damascus Domestic Service in Arabic 0415 GMT 25 Feb 78 JN

[Press review]

[Text] Under the headline "The End of the Visit and the Questions Raised," ATH-THAWRAH says in an editorial on the second page that the joint statement issued at the end of this visit clearly emphasizes a number of points and principles which stress the necessity of developing the relations of friendship and cooperation between Syria and the Soviet Union on the basis of mutual interests, understanding and confidence. What is important in these points and principles is that they stress the strategic aspect of Arab-Syrian-Soviet relations and frankly call for opening a new range for developing and strengthening these relations. This fact, in the eyes of several political observers, forms the logical prologue to the larger sphere, that is, the Middle East conflict in its present status and principled interactions.

The newspaper further says: On this basis, it is possible to say that the agreement between the Soviet Union and Syria to combat all the capitulatory trends presently occurring in the region or whose features loom on the horizon means that the two parties have jointly decided to bring matters back to their natural status and to contain the attempts to fragment the Arab cause and solve it by partial and separate methods, out of their conviction that the settlement of the crisis cannot be achieved except through comprehensive means which will restore rights to their lawful owners and will compel the enemies to respect the Arab nation's will for liberation.

When the two parties talk about the Arab front of confrontation and steadfastness and affirm that it is the political substitute for the As-Sadat capitulatory initiative, this acquires a special importance at present, for it simply means that the treacherous course followed by the regime of the Egyptian president is diametrically opposed to the principles of a comprehensive settlement.

In fact, it is aimed at concluding a separate deal at the expense of the Arab nation's cause. If we proceed from these clear points to reach the proposed beginning [as heard], we can say that the results of President al-Asad's visit to Moscow will be reflected in a positive manner in relations between the two parties. These relations, in themselves, include all the events and developments occurring in the region, which will move closer and closer to the geopolitical positions of the Arab struggle movement and its legitimate aims.

Under the headline "What About the Future of Arab-Soviet Relations?" ATH-THAWRAH carries a column saying: In light of the various facts outlined by the joint statement following President al-Asad's visit to Moscow and his cordial and constructive discussions with the Soviet leaders, one main fact takes precedence over the others: It is the positive outlook and the joint and single concept of the relations binding us to the socialist bloc, particularly the Soviet Union, and the stress on the importance of developing and strengthening these relations. This will not only serve the Arab struggle against the challenges faced by the Arab nation, but will also help the liberation and progressive forces in the world in their fight against the challenges they face.

ATH-THAWRAH further adds: If we want to determine the platform and bases of these future relations, their general guidelines will be as follows: 1) to strengthen and develop these relations continuously in the political, economic, military, cultural, scientific and technical fields on a basis of equal rights, mutual respect and independence; 2) to concentrate in the first place economic cooperation in all major fields--energy, electricity, oil industry, transport and irrigation--to support Syria's national independence and its progressive development and to create a solid material economic base as the foundation for the socialist transformation for the benefit of the productive and working masses; 3) to formulate measures capable of maintaining the expansion of the defensive capability of Syria, a country of confrontation and steadfastness, to guarantee the strategic balance between it and the Zionist enemy, because it is now the main confrontation front against the Zionist-imperialist plots since the As-Sadat regime has excluded Egypt from the arena of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

ATH-THAWRAH concludes: Stemming from these principles, there is a speedy task to be carried out for continued and constructive Arab-Syrian-Soviet cooperation. This task consists of opposing the separate deals and in bolstering the front of Arab countries rejecting such deals. It also means the existence of a determination to continue the joint efforts to achieve a just and lasting solution to the Middle East crisis.

To oblige the enemy to withdraw and to guarantee the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people undoubtedly requires, at this stage, the cohesion of all the progressive forces and the coordination of their hopes, as a fundamental factor to achieve this urgent task. The more we emphasize this fact the better we can face the destructive attempts by imperialism and reaction against Soviet-Arab relations.

MILITARY DELEGATION EXPECTED TO LEAVE FOR MOSCOW

JN261038Y Damascus SANA in Arabic 0850 GMT 26 Feb 78 JN

[Text] Damascus, 26 February--The newspaper TISHRIN said today on its front page that it has learned that the Soviet leadership has shown understanding for Syria's insistence on the necessity of establishing a strategic balance in all areas between Syria and the Zionist enemy. TISHRIN added that agreement was reached on taking practical and urgent measures commensurate with the importance of the Middle East struggle and on studying the means for deepening cooperation in the political, economic and military fields to insure the implementation of what was agreed on during the Soviet-Syrian discussions in Moscow.

TISHRIN further stated that a high-level Syrian military delegation is expected to leave for Moscow in the next few days for discussions with Soviet military officials on measures to increase the support of Syria's defensive capabilities. TISHRIN added that the Syrian Arab side at the Moscow discussions stressed the role of the Soviet Union in achieving a strategic balance between Syria and the Zionist enemy. The Syrian side also expresses Syria's desire for Soviet participation in the Middle East peace process.

DEPUTY PREMIER RECEIVES SOVIET CHARGE D'AFFAIRES

JN261758Y Damascus SANA in Arabic 1720 GMT 26 Feb 78 JN

[Text] Damascus, 26 February--Deputy Prime Minister for Economic Affairs Jamil Shayya received at 1730 today the Soviet charge d'affaires in Damascus. The meeting dealt with economic relations between the Syrian Arab Republic and the Soviet Union.

ICATU OFFICIAL CLAIMS MALTREATMENT IN CAIRO

JN251302Y Damascus Domestic Service in Arabic 1215 GMT 25 Feb 78 JN

[Text] Cairo--Reports from Cairo say that the Egyptian regime is adopting the most odious methods in its treatment of the nationals of the steadfastness and confrontation states, particularly Syrian and Libyan nationals. Even the families of those working with the various Arab League agencies are suffering all sorts of torture. The most recent incident of this nature perpetrated by the Egyptian regime was the maltreatment which brother 'Uthman 'Abu, ICATU assistant secretary general, suffered on Friday in Cairo airport when he arrived there to visit his family and children.

Brother 'Abu stated that his family and children have been residing in Cairo for 9 years and that he received permission from the Egyptian authorities to visit his family. He was surprised on Thursday when three Egyptian intelligence men came to his home, took him to the airport and detained him in a dark room with several Libyan and Syrian nationals for 24 hours, during which he was subjected to all sorts of torture, beating and curses. He returned to Damascus on Friday evening without being able to contact his family in Cairo.

ALGERIA

EL MOUDJAHID COMMENTS ON EGYPT'S 'TARNISHED' POLICY

LD231721Y Algiers EL MOUDJAHID in French 21 Feb 78 p 1 LD

[A. Bahmane article: "The New 'Centurions'"]

[Text] The virtual end of the state of belligerence between Israel and Egypt coincides with open and increasingly heavy political and military involvement by the Cairo regime outside Egypt's borders. Anwar as-Sadat's army, which is one of the most powerful forces in the Near East and was for a long time directed against Israel, is now being used against states in the area, particularly Arab and African states. Paradoxically, as the outcome of the hijacked Cypriot aircraft saga has just demonstrated, Cairo is borrowing the methods of its present policy--not the least of which is terrorism--from its former enemy.

Apart from its tragic and deplorable side for the new "centurions" of the Middle East, the Egyptian commando intervention against the Cyprus Airways DC-8 ushers in a new style of conducting international affairs in Cairo which, in more than one respect, gives priority to interference in internal affairs, with the practice of intervention as a corollary. By an irony of fate--perhaps because the Larnaca raid was meant to be a repeat of the sinister episode at Entebbe--Tel Aviv has assured Anwar as-Sadat of its support for such undertakings.

It is true that Egypt and Israel are progressively strengthening the links forged by their leaders at the Al-Quds [Jerusalem] and Ismailia meetings. All the signs are that a kind of political-military alliance is taking shape between the two capitals, two heads of the same hydra whose body is formed by the armaments and money dished out by the Americans: The nascent Egyptian exorcism is already striving to match the well-developed Israeli exorcism, by taking up the cause of one of the sides in the Ogaden conflict in the Horn of Africa, by maintaining border tension with the Libyan Jamahiriyah and by fomenting the internal crisis in Chad.

The presence in Somali territorial waters of two Egyptian battleships "on a special mission" to "defend" the port of Berbera and the deliberate violation of Cypriot sovereignty which the Larnaca hijacking has just provoked prove that the Cairo authorities do not allow international jurisdiction or human and material considerations to stand in their way when they carry out their tasks.

This prospect is particularly worrying since it appears to affect the Palestinian people. Observers noted that during the funeral of Yusuf as-Siba'i the Cairo authorities tried to create distinctly anti-Palestinian feeling among the Egyptian people, despite the fact that the PLO has disclaimed all responsibility for the murder of President Anwar as-Sadat's former adviser.

In attacking the hijacked Cypriot aircraft with heavy weapons, did the Egyptian commando force show any concern for the lives of the Palestinian leaders and other hostages held in the plane?

Besides, why should there have been such an operation? The bloody clashes with the Cypriot National Guard and the fearful confusion which reigned at the airport show that the raid was not carried out with the cooperation of the Cypriot authorities.

It was a suicidal raid aimed, with complete disregard for the lives of dozens of Egyptian soldiers, at causing a psychological shock if it had succeeded, which, in the eyes of the Egyptian people, would have enhanced the tarnished image of Cairo's present policy toward Israel. It was an inadmissible act intended as a form of pressure on Cyprus, a state which has never disguised its sympathies for the Palestinian cause.

Once again the Cairo regime has "distinguished" itself on the international scene. It is true that an element of the spectacular has entered its political behavior. But just as in the past it suffered the humiliation of Israeli demands at Al-Quds and Ismailia, so today it is experiencing the setbacks of a military defeat and a political failure which places Egypt in a critical position.

LIBYA

JANA ON LARNACA INCIDENT, AS-SADAT'S REACTION

LD241530Y Tripoli JANA in English 1413 GMT 24 Feb 78 LD

["Egyptian President's Insanity"--JANA Headline"]

[Text] Cairo, February 24, JANA--"The Egyptian president is getting more and more insane. This became clear when he addressed the remnants of his commando force" on its return from its abortive action in Cyprus. Despite the blow dealt to his force by the Cypriot National Guard, President as-Sadat still believes his threats. "The Palestinian before the rest of the Arabs must know that Egypt will return each blow she receives tenfold." This means that whenever an Egyptian is hit by a foreign [as received] he will hit back against ten Arabs.

As-Sadat has accused the Palestinians of allowing themselves to become murders and terrorists. He is repeating what his Israeli masters are saying. As-Sadat went on to say with arrogance "that Egypt shall remain, whether they like it or not, at the heart of the Arab nation and the key to all the problems in the area." Like all insane people, As-Sadat's statement could not be without contradiction. His insistence that he is prepared to go to the end of the world to prevent the spilling of even one drop of Egyptian blood is betrayed by his adventure in Cyprus which cost the lives of 15 Egyptian people.

As-Sadat went on to contradict himself even further by asking Cyprus to hand over the two hijackers. However, in another part of his speech he claimed with absurdity and impunity: "The general commander had informed me that the commandos have carried out completely the task ascribed to them and have arrested the murderers and released the hostages," but As-Sadat did not tell his soldiers the reason behind his demand for Cyprus to hand over the two hijackers, whom his men had arrested as he claimed.

President as-Sadat did not explain how the force he sent to Cyprus after losing a quarter of its men and the rest fallen prisoners can arrest the murderers and release the hostages. He went on to say with the arrogance of a madman, when my men moved in to restore dignity and honor to President Kyprianou, we find him committing a vicious crime." [quotation marks as received] does As-Sadat really believe that all leaders are like him? Accepting aggression against their sacred land and not resisting it? As-Sadat has dishonored the Egyptian forces by ordering them to carry out this foolish abortive operation without justification. How did As-Sadat dare to congratulate his commandos after returning from their fiasco? As reported by the state Egyptian news agency, like all insane people, As-Sadat did not forget to resort to intimidation by threatening the Cypriot president, claiming it was a crime Kyprianou defended his country.

AL-QADHDHAFI WARNS AGAINST INTERFERING IN AFRICA

LD250434Y Tripoli Voice of the Arab Homeland in Arabic 2315 GMT 24 Feb 78 LD

[Excerpts] Leader of the great 1 September revolution Col Mu'ammarr al-Qadhdhafi warned colonialism and reaction against the bad consequences of interfering in Africa's and Africans' internal affairs. In his speech after the reading out of the final joint communique on the talks of the four African leaders in Sabha, Colonel al-Qadhdhafi stressed that African problems and issues can only be settled by the Africans themselves. This meeting, he said, sincerely shows the capability of Africa to settle its problems and study the positions of its countries and the cooperation of its peoples.

The brother colonel explained that the African leaders pinned great hopes on the meeting which is to take place on 21 March in Sabha between the Chad revolutionaries and the Chad Government under the chairmanship of Sudanese First Vice President Abu al-Qasim Muhammad Ibrahim.

JANA: CHAD, LIBYA TO RESTORE DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS

LD241804Y Tripoli JANA in Arabic 1700 GMT 24 Feb 78 LD

[Text] Sabha--JANA has learned that the government of the Republic of Chad has decided to restore to normal diplomatic relations between it and the Jamahiriyah and the government of Chad has accepted the immediate return of the Jamahiriyah ambassador to Ndjamena.

JALLUD RETURNS FOLLOWING 2-DAY VISIT TO TURKEY

LD241758Y Tripoli JANA in Arabic 1700 GMT 24 Feb 78 LD

[Excerpt] Tripoli--Staff Maj 'Abd as-Salam Jallud returned at noon today to Tripoli from Turkey following a 2-day official visit at the invitation of Bulent Ecevit, Turkish premier.

NIGER, CHAD PRESIDENTS LEAVE FOLLOWING TALKS

LD251157Y Tripoli JANA in Arabic 1115 GMT 25 Feb 78 LD

[Excerpt] Sabha--Presidents Seyni Kountche of Niger and Malloum of Chad left this morning from Sabha International Airport after taking part in the meetings of the four African presidents held in Sabha which culminated in the publication of a final statement yesterday.

TUNISIA

NOUIRA OPENS MEETING WITH GENERAL UNION OF LABOR

LD251024Y Tunis Domestic Service in Arabic 0900 GMT 25 Feb 78 LD

[Text] At 0920 this morning Prime Minister Hedi Nouira, secretary general of the party, presided over the opening of an extraordinary conference of the General Union of Labor at the conference hall in Mohamed V Street. Hedi Nouira spoke of the need to continue the dialog and consultations among competent opposites. He stressed the importance of responsible dialog and of an appreciation for the national interest. He underlined the importance of honesty and good intentions. He also stressed the importance of all social groups shouldering their responsibilities and of reaching commitments--especially those connected with the April (?date).

HEDI NOUIRA GIVES SPEECH AT UGTT CONFERENCE

LD251444Y Tunis Domestic Service in Arabic 1200 GMT 25 Feb 78 LD

[Excerpts] The extraordinary session of the Tunisian General Union of Labor [UGTT] began its work at the conference hall in the capital at 0915 under the chairmanship of Hedi Nouira, prime minister and secretary general of the party, and in the presence of a number of members of the Political Bureau and government and representatives of the national organizations, together with 455 representatives of trade union cadre and branches and 100 observers.

The inaugural meeting was opened by a speech by Tijani Ubayd, acting secretary general of the UGTT, who welcomed the prime minister and members of the Political Bureau and government, representatives of the national organizations, others attending the conference and guests. He then invited Hedi Nouira to speak.

Hedi Nouira began his speech by drawing a lesson from the crisis created by the former leadership of the UGTT, indicating that the crisis has now passed and that there is now sincere determination for steady work. He said that the holding of this conference is in itself proof of the resilience of Tunisia and the ability of its cadres and sound base to overcome difficulties. The UGTT, thanks to the vigilance of its cadres, was able to rid itself of the deviationists and to hold this conference.

He added: I address those present at the conference not as head of the government but as a member of society and as secretary general of the party to assure the conference of the government's and party's adherence to the contractual policy and to the social and economic policy which we have chosen free from coercion and intimidation. He said: we reject the dictatorship of one group over another. Indeed, we seek to free Tunisian people from all pressures within the framework of a moderate society which assures a dignified life to all members of the nation in stability, freedom and real democracy.

Hedi Nouira went on to explain the national programs and options which Tunisia has pursued to establish a society of justice and dignity on the basis of a consensus of all social organizations. It has become inevitable to continue the contractual policy in sincerity and honesty to achieve the aspirations of the nation. He observed that the success of this policy is the responsibility of all. As we have an appointment next April, I would like to confirm the adherence of the government and party to this appointment and their commitment to everything which has been agreed upon, Hedi Nouira said. It will be an opportunity to go deeper into all questions relating to prices and production and to determine the next plan in light of developments in the community. The debate on these issues will continue, the aim being that the social organization should be adequately conscious of its responsibilities. There are two prerequisites for this: clean hands and assumption of responsibilities by the social organizations.

Here Hedi Nouira stressed the independent nature of the UGTT and its status as a social organization. He noted that an attempt was made to organically bind the UGTT to the party, but the latter rejected this on the grounds that the existing bond between the party and UGTT is stronger than an organic tie; it is a bond of national unity thanks to which we have been able to make some outstanding gains.

Hedi Nouria analyzed the tragedies which may ensue from the class struggle and expressed the hopes which the people attach to the success of this conference in order to assure the future of the UGTT and to hold this success as the most eloquent reply to those who pursue a path of anarchy and demagogism in trade union work. Such work in the advanced countries is practised within the framework of dialog and negotiations, not on the basis of class conflict. The present-day economy can no longer stand strikes. Thus, strikes have become rare in advanced countries such as Germany, Japan and Scandinavian countries. There is another reason for banishing strikes in Tunisia. It is that we have chosen the policy of contract, dialog, quest for social justice and resistance to every form of injustice and violation of the rights of others.

He said: Our party is the only one among the parties of the Third World countries which has enjoyed such prestige and vigor as to enable it to avoid all the shackles which exist in the Third World countries. This has led some to be envious of this party, because they have failed while the party succeeded, although they themselves lacked neither wealth nor revolutionary slogans.

Hedi Nouria's speech was met with deep enthusiasm and cheers by those present at the conference, who punctuated his speech with warm applause and acclamation for the supreme combatant.

Following Nouria, Tijani Ubayd delivered the UGTT address. He observed that the extraordinary conference responds to the expectations of the trade union base and cadres of the organization. He reviewed the history of the trade union movement in Tunisia since its inception at the hands of Muhammad Ali and analyzed the genuine national principles on which the UGTT is based, stressing that the conference is being held to underline these principles and to rid the national trade union movement of the blemishes which it incurred as a result of deviation from these principles and from purely trade union activities, despite the great financial potential of the union arising from its numerous properties.

He said that the grassroots of working people call for checking the accounts of the income of the union and for using it in a manner beneficial to the workers, adding that the trade union base calls for the need to bring back the union to its natural path and to rid it of all conduct likely to bring it into disrepute. Tijani Ubayd called on the conference to express its view on the deviation of the former leadership of the union and to suspend the deviationist elements from all trade union activities pending the verdict of the law. He also called for the election of a new leadership for the union with the necessary qualification of competence, honesty and seriousness.

UGTT EXECUTIVE BUREAU, SECRETARY GENERAL ELECTED

LD252000Y Tripoli Domestic Service in Arabic 1900 GMT 25 Feb 78 LD

[Excerpts] The extraordinary congress of the Tunisian General Union of Labor [UGTT], held today in Tunis, has elected the union's new Executive Bureau. Here is a list of the members of the bureau: Tijani Abdi; Mustapha Makhlouf; Ahmed Amara; Habis Chaouch; Touhami Achour; Lakhdar Jilidi; Ismael Lajri; Kheireddine Bouslah; Farhat Dachraoui; Taieb Mansour; Abdallah Ben Said; Abderrahman Khabthani; Mohamed Ali Shili.

The new Executive Bureau of the UGTT, as elected by today's extraordinary congress, has elected Tijani Abid as secretary general of the UGTT. The congress has reaffirmed its full support for the supreme struggler and its confidence in the government of Hedi Nouria.

A resolution passed unanimously by the congress said that the UGTT will continue its cooperation with world trade unions. Tijani Abid noted during the discussion of the resolution that the first task of the new executive bureau is to clarify the situation resulting from the recent crisis. He said: It is our duty to trade unionists to express our resolve to work seriously. The Destourian Socialist Party, he said, will remain as it was; the party of the entire Tunisian nation; we have duties as well as rights toward it. As from today, Mr Abid said, we will proceed along this line: on the basis of the complementary nature of the work of the UGTT and the Socialist Party.

Approves Amendments to Basic Statute

LD251808Y Tunis Domestic Service in Arabic 1600 GMT 25 Feb 78 LD

[Text] The extraordinary conference of the Tunisian General Union of Labor [UGTT] re-convened this afternoon. First it heard the report of the committee [words indistinct]. No objection was raised and the conference approved the report.

Then the report of the committee charged with amending the basic statute of the UGTT was submitted. The conference unanimously approved the amendments to some of the chapters of the statute. According to these amendments the number of the UGTT Executive Bureau will be 13 instead of 12 and the election of the secretary general will be by members of the Executive Bureau and not by the conference, as has been the case hitherto, on the grounds that a conference election gives the secretary a special distinction which makes him the sole arbiter on UGTT matters, and consequently it loses its democratic character.

The amendments also included one which would (?prevent) any one against whom [word indistinct] court sentence had been passed from assuming trade union responsibility [words indistinct].

A list of 54 candidates for the membership of the Executive Bureau was then submitted, but the voting covered only (?26) of them on the grounds that the rest did not fulfill the legal conditions for membership of the Executive Bureau. The voting was by secret ballot.

INTERIOR MINISTRY LIFTS STATE OF EMERGENCY

LD251234Y Tunis Domestic Service in Arabic 1200 GMT 25 Feb 78 LD

[Text] The Ministry of the Interior has issued the following communique:

This is to inform all citizens that the state of emergency was lifted throughout the republic as of 0000 today, Saturday 25 February, in application of the provisions of Order No 78/148 dated 24 February 1978.

The Ministry of the Interior has issued another communique:

This is to inform all citizens that the requirements of Order 79/51 dated 26 January 1978 on the ban of demonstrations and the imposition of a curfew in and suburbs will remain in effect and that the curfew on persons and vehicles will remain in force in Tunis and suburbs from midnight until 0400 until further notice.

V. 27 Feb 78

I S R A E L

N 1

CABINET SEES NO NEED TO CHANGE SETTLEMENTS POLICY

Official Announcement

NC261345Y Jerusalem Domestic Service in English 1200 GMT 26 Feb 78 NC

[Excerpts] Now we go over to the prime minister's office where the Israel Cabinet meeting on settlement and political affairs has just ended. This statement was made by Cabinet Secretary Arye Na'or. [begin recording]

The Cabinet had a discussion concerning the political problems and the problem of settlements. The cabinet decided that it does not need any new decisions concerning those two items.

[Indistinct question]

[Answer] As far as I know, there is no plan for new settlements in the Sinai.

[Question] Not in the Sinai, in the other areas: in the West bank, in the Golan Heights, the Gaza Strip.

[Answer] In the Judea and Samaria area, as far as I know, there is a plan relating to settlements.

Further Details of Session

TA261838Y Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 1705 GMT 26 Feb 78 TA

[From the Evening Newsreel]

[Excerpts] The Cabinet met today to discuss the problem of the settlements. At the end of the session it decided that there was no room for the new decisions on this matter. The session was held for the most part as a session of the Ministerial Committee on Security Affairs. This permits the session's debates to be kept secret. From this it follows that our political correspondent, Shalom Qital, was left with little to report.

[Qital] After a debate which lasted 8 hours, 5 hours last Monday and 3 hours today, the Cabinet decided that it did not need any new decisions on the issue of settlements. This is the laconic announcement given today by Cabinet Secretary Arye Na'or. Even when we asked for explanations of the decision which followed such a protracted discussion, in which most of the Cabinet ministers took part, the Cabinet secretary gave no details. [begin recording]

[Na'or] The meaning of the announcement is that the Cabinet does not need new decisions and if there are no new decisions, there is no cancellation of previous decisions.

[Qital] In accordance with this decision, which continues the previous policy, will there be any new settlements beyond the green line area or not?

[Na'or] Let us wait and see.

[Qital] I repeat the question which has already been asked: Was this decision made by a majority or unanimously?

[Na'or] This is the decision of the Cabinet of Israel and I cannot add anything to it. [end recording]

[Qital] Well, what is concealed behind the remark that the Cabinet does not need new decisions? What are the old decisions on which the settlement will be established in the coming weeks in Qidmat Sinai [southeast of Rafah] and the Rafah approaches. Secondly, another two footholds will be established in Judaea and Samaria in military camps--this in accordance with the Cabinet decision made a few weeks ago about establishing three settlements in Judaea and Samaria; of these, one has already been established and another two remain--but no new settlements. To remind you, when they want to establish a new settlement, there must be a decision by the full Cabinet, a decision by the Ministerial Committee for Settlement Affairs is not sufficient. Settlements already in existence in the territories will be fleshed out with personnel, money and facilities. All this is at least until the talks that the prime minister, the foreign minister and the defense minister are to have with President Carter in Washington. Those talks will be the middle of next month.

Labor Party Reaction

TA261645Y Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 1600 GMT 26 Feb 78 TA

[Excerpt] The Labor Party has expressed surprise over the Cabinet's decision not to decide on the issue of settlements. The party's reaction team is demanding of the Cabinet that it decide on the issue and make a decision regarding the timing of the settlements and their location. The Cabinet must conduct the negotiations for peace and it cannot permit itself delays such as a prolonged discussion on an issue which is so important to the political processes. That was the Labor Party announcement.

Peres Comments

TA261859Y Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 1705 GMT 26 Feb 78 TA

[From the Evening Newsreel]

[Text] We have one reaction on the matter of the Cabinet decision on the issue of the settlements. Chairman of the Labor Party Shim'on Peres, reacts:

[Peres] The Cabinet decided on a quiz I think. It slid out of deciding where it is permitted and where it is forbidden to settle; when it is permitted and when forbidden. I always remember the story about the Russian doctor who rushed into the hospital and asked the nurse to give him the average temperature of the patients. In every place we have a different situation, a different temperature, and the Cabinet should have either not discussed it at such a time, or it should have told the public trying to follow what the Cabinet is doing where we stand; not only the public, but world public opinion, since this issue has become a burning, central, disputed issue, which demands an Israeli explanation.

I ask myself, what can a normal person, following the Cabinet's decision, say to his friend in Israel or his acquaintance abroad about just where we stand on such an important issue?

Jerusalem POST Interpretation

TA270658Y Jerusalem POST in English 27 Feb 78 pp 1, 2 TA

[By Asher Wallfish and David Landau]

[Text] Israel will practise a virtual moratorium on new settlements in the areas, without actually proclaiming one as such. [paragraph continues]

At the same time, it rejects any phrasing of the Palestine question in the declaration of principles now being discussed with Egypt, which would go significantly further than the West Bank autonomy scheme already proposed by Israel.

This was an authoritative interpretation offered to the POST last night of the communique issued following yesterday's weekly Cabinet session. The statement said that the Cabinet had discussed political matters as well as the question of settlements and had decided that no new decisions were required on either of these spheres.

No new settlements at all will be established in the Yamit (Rafah) area, it would seem from the Cabinet decision. The settlements there will be strengthened in the normal manner by sending more settlers and developing their farm holdings, but without the kind of allegedly surreptitious expansion tantamount to creating additional village-nuclei attributed to Agriculture Minister Ariel Sharon last month.

(In the Yamit area this week, earth moving equipment was in operation at two sites only.)

Only two more settlements will be set up in Samaria before Passover: Tapuah and Silat az-Zahr. These were decided on a few weeks ago in the Cabinet and ratified in the Knesset Foreign Affairs and Defense Committee, despite an appeal by the Democratic Movement for Change. The third site decided on at that time for Samaria, Tel Haris, is already established.

In the West Bank, existing settlements will also be strengthened by adding inhabitants and intensifying agricultural development work, as in the Sinai. There, too, there will be none of the allegedly devious expansion operations tantamount to opening up fresh sites. As Cabinet Secretary Arye Na'or put it yesterday, uncharacteristically frank in his weekly briefing to Cabinet reporters at Bet Agron: "There will be no tricks."

At the same time, the Cabinet decision saying "no new decisions are needed" does not preclude the establishment of additional settlements in circumstances other than the present ones, such as the breakdown of negotiations with Egypt or the final refusal of Jordan to enter talks.

The coalition consensus is that little need exists for more settlements in the Sinai in any case, but that ideological and security considerations would call for more in Judaea and Samaria if Israel were to have a free hand.

At present, and for the past three months or so, all decisions to set up new settlements have to be made in the full Cabinet and not by the Committee of Ministers on Settlement, as was the case in the past under the Alignment-led coalition and in the initial phase of the Likud-led coalition.

"The Cabinet decision means 'Ezer Weizman got what he wanted in real terms,' one political leader told the POST last night. "Weizman was the only minister who talked hard-nosed logic since the settlement controversy started, and he won Premier Menahem Begin over to his side."

Premier Begin himself was reported last week as suggesting that the Cabinet made a new decision proclaiming Israel's inalienable right to settle all over historic Eretz Yisra'el (the implementation of this right to be in circumstances, places and time of Israel's choosing).

One authoritative source told the POST that this blanket decision was proposed last week by one of Begin's close associates in his name as a trial balloon, and not by the premier himself. It did not meet with wide support last week or in subsequent conversations between ministers.

According to one source, the DMC ministers felt yesterday that the substance of the Cabinet decision was sound, but they differed among themselves as to the most suitable phrasing. For the past few days they had been publicly demanding a clear statement ending further settlement.

The Cabinet discussed settlement in the light of the present phase of the negotiations for three hours yesterday, following the nearly five hours it devoted to this topic last week.

After last week's meeting Premier Begin had told reporters he expected a unanimous resolution to emerge on the settlement issue winding up the discussion. Yesterday's Cabinet decision was considered by observers to be less clear-cut than what Begin had originally anticipated.

While some put this change down to the Cabinet's reluctance to announce anything which might exacerbate relations with Washington at this time or be exploited by those who accuse Israel of hampering negotiations, other observers said Begin was anxious not to provoke domestic criticism as well, from backers of Gush Emunim.

As one observer put it: "The ministers did not want not to decide. They did not want not to decide. They wanted to decide without saying so."

The Cabinet will hold another political discussion before Premier Begin and Foreign Minister Moshe Dayan leave for the U.S. Weizman's visit to the U.S. was approved at yesterday's session.

Meanwhile, roving U.S. envoy Alfred Atherton is due to meet with Begin and Dayan today to receive Israel's reply to the latest Egyptian proposals. By all accounts, the two sides have not moved towards each other substantially during Atherton's first shuttle round. But observers expect the U.S. diplomat to persevere until Begin leaves for his Washington visit in a fortnight--in the hope that a breakthrough can be achieved then.

Other Press Reaction

TA270900Y Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 0505 GMT 27 Feb 78 TA

[Review of morning press editorials]

[Excerpt] HA'AREZ writes that the government would not be missing any opportunities if now and in the near future it refuses to allow new settlements. The government will have to work hard to repel the pressure to dismantle existing settlements and to provide the settlers with suitable living and security conditions. We would not be wrong to assume that the decision not to decide was made as the most convenient solution against the background of the differences of opinions between ministers on the settlements issue. However, what can prevent a deepening of the dispute among members of the government will not necessarily calm foreign elements.

HAZOFE writes that the government should consider its moves on the settlement issue logically and emotionally while remaining faithful to the heritage of our forefathers and while assuming responsibility for the timing of the settlements. If this is yesterday's government decision then this is a wise and considered decision.

'AL HAMISHMAR writes that the decision not to decide means only that the existing situation will continue. In this situation there will be no new formal decisions, as it were, while Ari'el Sharon and his supporters will be establishing facts in the field. We have to warn against this trend.

HAMODI'A believes that the government's decision satisfies, in practical terms, the trend not to worsen relations with the United States while its declaration does not contradict the Likud center's policy on the right to settle in all parts of Eretz Yisra'el even though further settlement activity requires a special government decision.

DAYAN INTERVIEWED ON EGYPT TALKS, SETTLEMENTS

TA241708Y Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 1505 GMT 24 Feb 78 TA

[From the Weekly Newsreel]

[Interview with Foreign Minister Moshe Dayan by Shalom Qital in Tel Aviv--date not given]

[Text] We have already heard in the news the main points of what was said by Foreign Minister Moshe Dayan in the interview with the weekly newsreel. Let us hear the entire interview with Mr Dayan. The interviewer is our political correspondent, Shalom Qital. [begin recording]

[Question] Mr Foreign Minister, a great many echoes have been reaching us recently, particularly over the last week, of your pessimism, pessimism about the chances of these negotiations. Is this indeed true? Are you pessimistic?

[Answer] I am really grateful to you for interviewing me and asking that question. Those descriptions, the description of pessimism and so on, came as a result of the leaks about what I said, about the report I gave to the Foreign Affairs and Security Committee, and my talk with employees of the Foreign Ministry and, as is natural, what I said was not reported completely. I really want to express matters as I see them. I do not know whether to call it pessimism. I think that is a definition which is not correct; it is not correct. What is correct is that I pointed, and I very much fear that I was not mistaken, to the difficulties facing us in the negotiations between us and the Egyptians and the U.S. mediation on the issue of the settlements, at this stage, and the declaration of principles--and the difficulties are many and basic. If pointing out difficulties means pessimism, you can call that pessimism. It would be more correct to say, and this must be done, that we must be aware of the situation and not make life simple or easy for ourselves.

[Question] Regarding difficulties, are there new difficulties which did not exist a month or 2 months ago, in Ismailia, and which have now been created?

[Answer] I think that there is a hardening in the Egyptian position and I assume that this is not only because our initial impression was that things would be easier, but that this is really an Egyptian subjective [as heard] hardening. Various definitions, to which they agreed at first, are not acceptable to them now. It may be that the reason for this is not that they have changed their position, but--and here, possibly, is the key to an understanding of what is happening--that the Egyptians themselves thought at first that they would be able to bring other countries, that is, Jordan and the representatives of the Palestinian Arabs, to the discussion table, with even more comprehensive definitions, less extremist ones, and when they did not come--when King Husayn and others put forward their conditions, which are much harder than maybe the Egyptians thought in the beginning--then the Egyptians hardened their position. So, these are not additional difficulties. [as heard] But, without doubt, there is a hardening in the Egyptian position.

[Question] What form does this take?

[Answer] It takes the form of a retreat--their desire for an Israeli retreat from all the territories, including Judaea and Samaria, and I fear also, from the aspect of the verbal commitment, [hithayvut milulit] from the Golan Heights, and certainly from the Sinai, and their desire for an Israeli commitment, in one form or another, to grant the Palestinian Arabs the right to self-determination. That is the key to the hardening.

[Question] I was caught by one phrase in your answer: verbal definition [hagdara milulit]. It appears to me that that, in fact, is what the declaration of principles is attempting to do, to create some sort of verbal definition after which it will be possible to continue negotiations. But, Mr Dayan, what is the value of playing with words through a declaration of principles, or whatever else it could be called, in order to enable the negotiations to continue when the substantive argument is in fact over much deeper things? The Egyptians want self-determination, we are speaking of independent administration. Why take so much trouble over a declaration of principles and not get straight down to the negotiations themselves?

[Answer] That is exactly what it's about. Let us take for example the Egyptian position on the Egyptian issue. There is no doubt that they have a position which differs from ours--with regard to issues between us and Egypt. But, as a prior condition between us and Egypt, they did not say that we should accept their position so that they would be able to begin with the negotiations. They said what they said--President as-Sadat, when he was in Jerusalem--and we said what we said, that our position was different. Prime Minister Begin presented our position. The Egyptians did not say: If you do not commit yourselves in advance to accept our position, there is no point in sitting at the table. This is different now with regard to the continuation, the declaration of principles, which deals purely with the issues of the Arabs in general and the Palestinians. They are not satisfied with presenting a position. Let us say our position says: This and that is our position and these are our proposals and if the others think otherwise, they have other proposals, they do not want to accept our peace program, they are, of course, entitled to come and make proposals of their own and we will discuss their proposals, even if they are different from and contradictory to our position. But the Egyptians--and they are doing this, I assume, in the wake of Jordan's position--are saying: No, if you do not commit yourselves in advance, before negotiations, without negotiations, to accept this extremist position about withdrawal and the Palestinians' rights and so on, then the Jordanians will not come and then there is no point in sitting down for negotiations. This is the difference; the difference that it is impossible to get to negotiations because they want Israel to take on itself, in advance, the position, the commitment, to agree to this extremist position, the Jordanian one--which is now being picked up by the Egyptians--and not to be satisfied with the fact, as is the case between us and Egypt, that there are different positions but that there is no prior condition by either side that the other side should accept its position in advance and that otherwise there is no point in negotiations.

[Question] Do I understand you correctly, Mr Dayan, that, at this time, what the Egyptians want is a version which will suit Jordan, a version which is harder, that it is difficult for us to accept such a version; Jordan is not yet joining in; and so, in fact, we possibly need to initiate an additional move?

[Answer] I do not know what an additional move is, but the objective fact in the difficulty in the situation is that Egypt apparently is not only not prepared to make a separate peace agreement--and I hear from various people, I read in the papers and I hear from Mr Rabin, Mr Peres, that it is possible in this way or that or at another speed to make peace with the Egyptians in a short period of time. [as heard] I speak of what I read in the papers. I have not heard these things from them with my own ears. Then the question is, in fact, what should we do in order to reach peace with Egypt? Does what we are trying to do concern only issues between us and Egypt, or does it concern something else. According to the best information and reports I know of, the situation is that Egypt is not prepared to make a separate agreement with us today--maybe it will change its mind--or even to hold separate negotiations for any length of time without Jordan joining in. It is Jordan that is raising conditions--under what conditions it is prepared to join in the negotiations--and there is here a question of a physical presence, not verbal; that is, Jordan's position is that if all these things, as they have been published in the name of Jordan, are not guaranteed then it will not come. The Egyptians are not prepared to conduct separate negotiations for peace with us without these partners. At any rate, this is the definition, which I read in the paper again today, by Secretary of State Vance, when he said that the objective of the declaration of principles is to broaden the group of participants, that the declaration should be such that it will be possible to broaden the group of participants until it includes both Jordan and Syria. Now, imagine what conditions we would have to guarantee in advance in order for Syria to agree to participate in the negotiations. That is the problem.

[Question] You mentioned Vance and the United States. What role does the United States play?

[Answer] It is playing the role of mediator, but it is also making, and will make, proposals of its own. I want to go back to the previous topic for a moment. Let us take the matter of the settlements. Well, it is not that this question does not exist. This question does exist, but I assume that, when the Americans raise this issue, it is not only because they think that the settlements themselves are illegal--that they represent an obstacle in the way of peace--but because they think that, in order for Jordan and so on to participate in the negotiations, we must commit ourselves to withdraw. The issue of the settlements is a part of the symbolic-type things, just as is the presence of IDF forces, and not just the settlements themselves, but that our approach should be one whereby we agree to a withdrawal from those territories. If you are prepared for a withdrawal, then what is the point of settlements? On the issue of the settlements--Israel's stand on its right to settle in Judaea and Samaria--the difference, from its point of view, lies in the fact that it does not include in its debt [presumably to the Arabs] of course, the recognition of--and Israeli willingness for--a withdrawal. It is not the settlements themselves, but--do we stay or do we withdraw? That is the question.

[Question] How do you see the question of the settlements?

[Answer] This--and the essence of the question of the settlements--in fact, I distinguish between two places in the territories, such as the territory in Sinai and the Rafah approaches and so on [as heard]--the settlements came, they represent one of the security measures of the State of Israel and I have not heard that the Egyptians or anyone else is saying: You know what, get rid of the settlements and instead station a tank battalion or some other military force and we won't care about that.

Someone says, why do you care about giving up the settlement? They must understand that it is not a matter of conceding the settlements and something else in the way of security that Israel is to supply, but a concession on the settlements and on the security measures which the settlements contain.

As for Judaea and Samaria and the Gaza Strip, the question is not only one of security, but, again, looking into the future, the question is whether we regard ourselves as having the right to settle, to buy land, to procure land, and settle on it, or do we think that this is not included among our rights? This is the key to the matter. Because if we think that this matter, even in a permanent settlement, should be one of our rights, then why must we stop it or give it up? Whoever thinks that we must stop or give up, must be given the reply: Does he think that in the peace settlement this thing should be within the sphere of our rights or not? If it should be within the sphere of our rights, then will it really make it easier for us in the future, in the context of the settlement, if we now stop, in any way whatsoever, the settlement? This is the question in principle, as it appears to me.

[Question] Mr Dayan, the middle of next month to close this question of the settlements and other questions, you will certainly be on the team which will talk with President Carter. Does the fact that this time the prime minister is traveling with the foreign and the defense ministers give a clue to the character of the talks, indicate a possibility that Israel will submit a new position or will change its positions?

[Answer] I do not know whether there is a connection. In my opinion, this is not in fact connected with the composition of the team or with that particular trip. However, there are two things which must be said. At any rate, I must say, I must stress them, when you say this is the end, or the conclusion, and they are these: We are certainly within the continuation of the deliberations and we are now in an advanced stage. We must come to the essence of things. The further we advance, the more we must come to the essence of things for they may [otherwise] fail and, looking at things in their essence, in my view, three principles should guide us. One: to be completely open to a renewed, new view of the matters and not only to be bound to past positions. We must say: Fine, we thought thus, we believed this, here, this is the situation, but [we must] be open, capable of seeing the thing, of seeing the situation, as it is and with new, realistic eyes. The second thing is, when we take decisions, when we take or will take--we, that's not the team [talking to Carter], but the team, the Cabinet and the nation of Israel, will now make decisions on these issues. It must see the future, the future in the long term. We are not only discussing peace. We are discussing Israel's permanent borders and not what will happen in another 2 or 3 months, but for many years and we must, with all the difficulties involved, also see from the military, security aspect and also from the principle, political aspect, the development of matters; we must try to see this from the long term, how what we are doing now will appear in several years. Third, maybe the most difficult in this situation, those same things we think we must be scrupulous about--because of this consideration [of the long-term view], not because that is what we said in the past--we must, as regards the future, show willingness for great consistency and obstinacy, with all the difficulty involved. There is possibly a contradiction here between the openness and the consistency and obstinacy, but in what we ought to be open on, we should be open, and what should be changed, should be changed.

But, things which we think are in our hearts, there is not alternative, with all the difficulty this involves, to being unyielding to the end concerning them.

[Question] Mr Foreign Minister, I thank you very much. [end recording]

DINITZ INTERVIEWED ON U.S.-ISRAELI TIES, U.S. ATTITUDE

TA242108Y Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 1505 GMT 24 Feb 78 TA

[From the Weekly Newsreel]

[Interview with Ambassador Simcha Dinitz by Eli Nissan in Washington--time not given; recorded]

[Text] Now to our ambassador in the United States. We must not upend our instincts and say: Let us see what good publicity is and make our policy accordingly; a distinction must be made between determination of policy and the explanation of that policy; it is Israel's policy that must answer Israel's challenges and problems; only after the policy has been determined should it be explained and transferred in order for it to gain the support of the policymakers and the setters of public opinion in the United States. This is the theoretical framework of our ambassador in Washington on the issue of explaining Israel's positions on the American continent. At the end of the week Simcha Dinitz gave an interview on this issue, that of publicity, to our correspondent in Washington, Eli Nissan. [begin recording]

[Question] Mr Dinitz, has Israeli publicity given the suitable answers to the latest developments which have been seen here, before and since As-Sadat's visit?

[Answer] I have no doubt that in the challenges we have faced recently we have come up against many publicity difficulties. These difficulties stemmed from the very fact that what is called our "case" is much more complicated, involved and sophisticated than the form of the presentation of the Arab claim or case. Therefore, every time we have come up against a new problem or a new challenge, the matter demanded a certain amount of time until the public could follow and absorb our approach or our counterclaims.

As-Sadat made a move which was called by many, among us as well, historic; a move with tremendous reverberations. We have to explain to the U.S. public that the importance of this move lies in the fact that he opened a process of negotiations and not in that he brought it to a conclusion; that its importance lies in the fact that he broke the psychological barrier, but he did not create the political formula which can only be created through negotiations. So, in the beginning, people say, what have you done for us? This is what As-Sadat has done for peace, what has Israel done? But, gradually, through work in the communications media, in visual communications media, in lectures, in appearances, in talks with Congress members, in talks with public opinion setters, in sending people to Israel, in the visits of respected people from Israel to make appearances here, public awareness is beginning to be disappointed and to understand that this historic move by As-Sadat has importance if it indeed creates the conditions for negotiations which can lead to an agreement--and every agreement is based on compromises and every agreement is based on give and take, it is not based on a unilateral declaration of prior conditions of this is how it is, take it or leave it--[for instance] the matter of the settlements.

[Question] We get the impression that Israel had no clear answer on that issue and I also understand that, in fact, two claims have been put forward here. The security claim, for example, was not mentioned at one period of time. Why?

[Answer] I am not aware that the security claim was not mentioned. I know that, from the very moment that the Cabinet, or that the prime minister, submitted the program for the Sinai to the U.S. President, and afterward to the Congress and then to the press, the entire package proposed for Sinai was based on Israel's security needs and this was explained and discussed from the beginning. We did not say to the Egyptians: We will return sovereignty over the Sinai to you so that you, the next day, can bring in tanks, cannon and an army to Sinai and that Sinai--which has been a focus for four attacks on Israel--will become a potential focus for a fifth attack. We said: We are prepared to return sovereignty over the entire Sinai under certain conditions, and the conditions are not conditions which clash with Egyptian sovereignty, but conditions which are bound up with Israel's security needs. The Egyptian attempt was to bypass the negotiating process through As-Sadat's trip to the United States with the aim of creating for himself sympathetic public opinion which would lead the United States into becoming a tool for pressuring Israel. That entire move, with its deliberate intention to focus to some extent the center of public interest--of the Egyptians as well as of others--on the question of the settlements--because their research had shown them that this was the point, when it is discussed separately, which is the easiest one with which to strike at Israel. [as heard] But, the moment we place the issue of the settlements in Sinai in the perspective of the security context, of the security lobby we need in order to defend our existence, to that extent we overcome--and we are still in a process of overcoming--the incorrect public concept they have tried to create.

As I say, the coordination is not always simple. It is complicated. It can never be taken from the general [word indistinct] and this is one of the great drawbacks when one tries to speak about settlements in Sinai as an ideology instead of as part of a security issue, and so we must, all the time, stress, first, the overall context of the settlements in the framework of Israel's security needs and, secondly, the importance or unimportance of the whole problem of settlement in the framework of the solution to the dispute, because, what we have to overcome is not the simple problem of whether Israel is permitted to have settlements; the problem which bothered a section of public opinion in the United States was whether it was disturbing the peace process. I must say that, as a result of our explanatory efforts and as a result of the visit by the foreign minister and of the work done before and after that, a more genuine understanding of the issue is beginning to be created and people are beginning to see where they really buried the dog, if I may use that expression. What is really holding up the ability and the possibility of achieving a settlement or, at least, negotiations--after all, we had all in all 1 and a 1/2 days of negotiations with As-Sadat, in order to solve all the problems--and, in my view, in this context, we have passed the ebb period and we are now in a period of a rise and increase in understanding of our case. [sentence as heard]

[Question] Why, in fact, did Israel not hurry to react on the matter of the supply of aircraft to Saudi Arabia and Egypt, when, for a few weeks, it had been clear that the administration was moving toward such a decision? Why was there silence up to the moment when the decision was made?

[Answer] Excuse me, but again, I do not accept that comment. It is basically incorrect. Israel's opposition to the sale of aircraft to Egypt and Saudi Arabia--first of all it was [opposition to sales] to Saudi Arabia, since the first move of the administration was toward Saudi Arabia, before Egypt was brought in--was in diplomatic channels even before the request was submitted, and in public channels the day the request was submitted. Not only was it not a day late, it was not an hour late. I think that nobody had any doubt, either before, at the time, or after, what Israel's position was.

[Question] You have certainly been made aware of the public opinion polls published recently which point to an apparent drop in support for Israel's case, both among the general U.S. public and in the communications media and Congress. Can you suggest a brief explanation for this phenomenon? Could you possibly say how, in your view, this problem can be attacked, if at all?

[Answer] I am convinced that we must not make this a tragedy for ourselves by not making a distinction between what I said earlier--the impressions of the U.S. public of As-Sadat's move in making his visit to Jerusalem and the reception he was given by the people in Israel, by the Cabinet and by the Knesset--and subordination and agreement to his specific demands. I have not seen any poll which indicates a change in U.S. public opinion with respect to the risk Israel can take on itself with an independent Palestinian state or a demand for an Israeli withdrawal to the 1967 borders or the repartition of Jerusalem. That is, we must make a distinction between sympathy for As-Sadat's move--which is a dramatic move and which certainly spoke to the imagination of the masses, given all the communications media which were put at its disposal--and U.S. public opinion's agreement for, or even its support of the ultimatum-type, specific demands of either As-Sadat or Husayn. Here I see no change and, not only do I see no change, I am convinced that, when we continue--and this is what we are doing--to explain our basic positions--after all, we are not fighting against As-Sadat as someone who traveled to Jerusalem and proposed making peace; we are fighting against that approach which makes unacceptable conditions, which endangers Israel's existence--with respect to the framework of negotiations for peace, or even without negotiations--and, in this area, I think there is support for our basic positions, for Israel's basic positions, which is strong in the United States. [as heard]

Of course, the task ahead of us is difficult because it is not [only] against the Arab countries that we have to struggle, but we will, possibly, in the future, also have to struggle with administration positions. But I have no doubt that in the end we will be able to cope with this because the United States--not only its representatives in Congress, but the entire nation--is not prepared to accept a version that Israel must, at the price of peace, endanger its very existence, because the peace of the graveyard is also peace--but that is not the peace in which the U.S. nation wants to see Israel. [end recording]

FOREIGN MINISTER DAYAN MEETS WITH ATHERTON

NC260648Y Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 0500 GMT 26 Feb 78 NC

[Text] U.S. Assistant Secretary of State Alfred Atherton yesterday conveyed to Foreign Minister Moshe Dayan the written text of Egypt's proposals for a joint declaration of principles with Israel. In these proposals Egypt takes a hard line, reiterating its demand for Israel's withdrawal from all the territories and for recognition of the Palestinian peoples' rights.

Our political correspondent, Shalom Gital, reports that an Israeli source has said that the Egyptian proposal does not advance the negotiations.

Tomorrow Alfred Atherton will meet with Prime Minister Menahem Begin. Yesterday he met with Foreign Minister Moshe Dayan. Following the meeting, Minister Dayan said that in the talks we will formulate our position, our reaction, and our remarks, and will present our agreement or disagreement to the Egyptian proposals. He considers that in this way the negotiations will resume.

Mr Atherton is due to leave for Amman, and perhaps for other Arab capitals.

COUNTERPROPOSALS TO EGYPTIANS GIVEN TO ATHERTON

TA271009Y Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 1000 GMT 27 Feb 78 TA

[Text] Today Israel submitted a modified proposal for a joint declaration of principles with Egypt at a meeting between the prime minister, the foreign minister and the defense minister with U.S. Assistant Secretary of State Alfred Atherton. Our political correspondent Shalom Gital has learned that there are some new formulations in Israel's proposal but there still remains a large gap between that and Egypt's inflexible proposal.

After the meeting Alfred Atherton told correspondents that in every talk, like that of today, there are new words and new ideas giving rise to hope. However, he refuses to define any meeting in terms of progress or lack of progress. In answer to a question from our political correspondent, Atherton said that at this stage he is trying to pass Israeli and Egyptian proposals between Jerusalem and Cairo and he is not carrying a U.S. proposal.

He will leave for Cairo tomorrow and return to Israel on Thursday. He intends to visit other Arab capitals, including Amman, but no date for this has been fixed.

DAYAN, UK MINISTER OWEN SPEAK AT BANQUET

TA262117Y Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 2100 GMT 26 Feb 78 TA

[Text] I believe As-Sadat when he says that he is looking for a new way to maintain relations with Israel. This remark was made by Foreign Minister Moshe Dayan at a banquet at the Hilton Hotel in Jerusalem where he was hosting his British counterpart, David Owen. Dayan said that behind As-Sadat's move is the fact that As-Sadat has realized that to prepare Egypt for another war would take 6 to 7 years and a great deal of financial backing. Dayan asked his British counterpart, and Britain to understand Israel's problems.

In reply, Foreign Secretary Owen said that there is no country which is in a better position than Britain, which was faced with the danger of death and destruction, to understand what threat, danger and isolation mean to a country, and therefore it gives us its understanding. Owen pointed out that at one time the Middle East was caught up in a pattern of statements and cliches and along came As-Sadat and the peace initiative and broke the pattern. It appears, Owen said, that the pattern is now being rebuilt and the sides are returning to the same language and intransigence as before. This must be prevented. Owen recalled that the peace program spoke of 5 years and that this had been forgotten. He said: We must concentrate our attention on details and minute details; the time has come for quiet debates over the details.

INDIA

VIETNAMESE PRIME MINISTER ADDRESSES PARLIAMENT

BK251030Y Delhi ISI in English 0917 GMT 25 Feb 78 BK

[Text of 24 February address by SRV Prime Minister Pham Van Dong to the Indian parliamentary group in New Delhi]

[Text] Your Excellency Vice President,

Distinguished members of Parliament,

It is a great honour for me, on behalf of the National Assembly and Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, to convey to you distinguished representatives of the great Indian people a message of friendship from the Vietnamese people.

The friendship between our two peoples is a time-honoured, durable and deep friendship stemming from our mutual understanding and respect, from our solidarity and mutual support in the struggle for the independence and freedom of our respective countries, from our multiform cooperation in national construction according to our respective paths, from our coordination in international activities--in the nonaligned movement in particular--for peace, national independence, democracy and social progress throughout the world.

For the Vietnamese people this pure and fine friendship is deeply rooted in long-standing cultural exchanges between our two countries, in our feelings and admiration for the civilisation and more importantly a civilisation which after so many trials over 50 centuries has preserved all its originality, its continuity and its unity. This is a most eloquent demonstration of the strong vitality of the Indian people who have always turned toward the lofty objectives of mankind--truth, freedom and happiness--and have always been open to new horizons, receiving the new values of the present that they think suitable. The true friends of the Indian people are gratified to note that the former birthplace of so many great works in philosophy, literature, arts, science and technology is also the native land of the green revolution in agriculture and of a strong development of heavy and light industries which have reached international standards in a number of branches, of rapid progress in science and technology with outstanding achievements in many fields. Clearly India is a country thriving in all respects. A nation of over 600 million very industrious, creative and talented people who have inherited one of the oldest and most brilliant cultures of mankind and have now become masters of a country the size of a continent with diversified and abundant resources is sure to record extraordinary achievements for its own benefit and also in the interests of peace and cooperation among nations.

Ladies and gentlemen,

The profound friendship between our two peoples clearly manifested itself in our multiform mutual support in a glorious struggle for the independence and freedom of each country. We Vietnamese followed with enormous enthusiasm and pride the tenacious and hard but increasingly vigorous and unremitting struggle waged by hundreds of millions of Indians determined to rid themselves of colonial domination and to win independence and freedom. This struggle is an epic testifying to the heroic, unyielding and ardently patriotic traditions of the Indian people, who at the forceful call of Mahatma Gandhi stood up, millions as one, in a struggle that shook the colonial rule to its foundations and brought the glorious victory of 15 August 1947. The people of Vietnam and many other nations welcomed with boundless joy and pride the Indian people's splendid victory which remains closely associated with the legendary figure of Mahatma Gandhi, founder of the Republic of India.

About the same time we Vietnamese, responding to President Ho Chi Minh's resounding call, stepped up our struggle with a determination that overwhelmed the enemy forces and led to the triumph of the August 1945 revolution and to the founding of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam on 2 September 1945. However, due to the intervention of imperialist forces, our fight for independence, freedom and reunification did not end then. It continued for 30 years and became the longest, hardest and most glorious struggle against imperialist aggression of the present times. Holding high the sacred banner of President Ho Chi Minh, who held that "nothing is more precious than independence and freedom" and united millions as one, we Vietnamese persisted in our fight, brought all our nation's strength and heroism to bear and won success after success until the splendid victory of spring 1975. This was a victory of the iron will of a nation willing to make every sacrifice to defeat an aggressor who was then considered invincible, a victory of human intelligence and strength over modern weaponry. People all over the world recognise that the Vietnamese people's victory was an event of historic and important international significance influencing many parts of the world. If I consider it necessary to recall here today the process of the Vietnamese people's struggle for independence, freedom and reunification, it is to express our sincere and profound gratitude to you, representatives of the Indian people, for your persistent, firm and strong support throughout an entire period of history. The Indian people's precious support, along with that of other nations, was a factor for the Vietnamese people's victory.

The Vietnamese people fought for many years with courage and sacrifice to become total masters of their country, to build a peaceful, independent unified and socialist Vietnam, to bring prosperity to the Socialist Republic of Vietnam and happiness to themselves and, at the same time, to fulfill their lofty international duty of aiding the liberation of other nations.

To overcome the extremely grave consequences of the war, to restore and develop the economy, to develop culture, to stabilise and gradually improve the people's living conditions we are mobilising all the energies of our people and all the resources of our country. If in the past our slogan was "all for the front, all for victory," now it is: "all for production, all for the construction of socialism, all for the prosperity of the fatherland and the people's welfare." Not even 3 years have elapsed since we won complete victory, yet during this very short period many achievements of great and far-reaching importance have been recorded. We are resolved to march forward in the spirit of a victor to do all we can to ensure the working people's right to be collective masters of society, considering it an extremely important factor for the construction of a new, prosperous, happy and civilised Vietnam with a high material life and a radiant and fine cultural and spiritual life.

In this great and long-term undertaking we rely mainly on our own strength while trying our best to establish relations of friendship and cooperation with all fraternal socialist countries and all friendly countries around the world and with international organisations including those of the United Nations. Today I am happy to express our warm gratitude for the precious support and assistance given us by the government and fraternal people of India in agriculture, industry, communications and transport, science and technology and other fields--support and assistance which are only initial steps. The friendship, mutual support and assistance and cooperation between our countries in the fields of economy, trade, culture, science and technology have fine possibilities and prospects. Through many stages of history our two peoples have realised more clearly than ever the importance of strengthening the friendship and multifarious cooperation between our two countries in our own interests and for the coordination of our international activities.

Ladies and gentlemen,

We still remember very clearly that after winning independence the leaders of the Indian Government laid down a very important direction for the international activities of the Republic of India. In fact India, under the leadership of Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru, was one of the promoters of the newly independent countries movement to defend their legitimate interests while making ever greater contributions to the cause of peace and national liberation in the world. We all remember the historic Bandung conference. Since then the movement has grown rapidly to become the movement of nonaligned countries today. In the present international situation everybody understands the increasing importance of the movement of nonaligned countries, and with good reason, because it includes the majority of countries and the greater part of mankind. Moreover, it includes many countries with the oldest and finest cultures, it controls very precious natural resources for the economy and life of many countries. What a cruel contradiction that it is these very countries which have endured so many centuries of oppression and exploitation, so much suffering and humiliation and are leading an unbearably poor and dim life.

This is where the movement of the nonaligned countries gets its strength from, the strength that comes with the desire for independence and sovereignty, for political, economic and cultural independence and sovereignty, genuine independence and sovereignty--certainly not the kind of formal independence and sovereignty that hides a new colonialist regime which is even more dangerous than old colonialism. In order to secure such independence and sovereignty, nonaligned countries must elicit mass support in their own countries and, at the same time, make every effort to expand alliances with the progressive forces in the world. This is a law for the development, in both size and essence, of the nonaligned countries movement of the Third World while working for a new international order for the vital interests of many economically underdeveloped countries which are victims of the imbalance of trade and payments and of unequal relations with developed capitalist countries.

At the Colombo conference of nonaligned countries in August 1976, I clearly expounded the stand and policy of the Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam on the above-mentioned questions and on the movement of nonaligned countries in general. I listened with pleasure to Prime Minister Morarji Desai's opening speech at the New Delhi ministerial conference of the coordinating bureau of the nonaligned countries in April 1977, noting that Vietnam's approach is close to India's on many points and, therefore, there are great possibilities for us to coordinate our actions in this extremely important international movement.

Our planet is witnessing far-reaching developments in keeping with the law of historical evolution. Mankind has been on the march since the stone age and everyone knows that most rapid and tremendous advances are happening in our times. Proceeding from that viewpoint, the Vietnamese people are convinced of the final victory of the just struggle of many peoples for their basic national rights, especially the struggle of the Arab peoples and the Palestinian people in the Middle and Near East, of the peoples of Zimbabwe, Namibia and Azania in southern Africa, which is arousing world public opinion. This is an inevitable trend of history and no reactionary force whatsoever can check it.

Closely linked by a sacred solidarity with the peoples of the world who have been supporting us, we, the Vietnamese people, will always be true to the ideal: "Nothing is more precious than independence and freedom." The independence and freedom of our own country and of other countries as well. This is the principled stand of the Vietnamese people and the Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam.

This stand, which shines of justice, has enjoyed the warm sympathy and support of the peoples of the world. Proceeding from this principled stand, the Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam is doing all it can for a fair and reasonable settlement of problems concerning the relations between Vietnam and Cambodia in keeping with the 5 February 1978 statement of the Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam. We are deeply convinced that in the end justice will prevail, the genuine friendship between the Vietnamese and Cambodian peoples will triumph and the desire of many peoples in the world will come true.

In this connection I think it necessary to make clear that immediately after achieving independence, freedom and national reunification the Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam set out to strengthen friendship and cooperation with other Southeast Asian countries in accordance with its four-point policy which has been appreciated by large sections of world public opinion. At the same time we have unceasingly broadened our relations in many fields and forms with countries in Asia and the Pacific and on other continents as well on the basis of the principles of peaceful coexistence.

Peace, friendship and cooperation are great and pressing demands of the current world situation in keeping with the interests of each country and of the international [sentence as received]. In our times it is an extremely important task to defend world peace. The Socialist Republic of Vietnam is determined to struggle together with other socialist countries, nonaligned countries and other forces of peace in the world for the realisation of this lofty aspiration of mankind.

Ladies and gentlemen,

During my stay in your glorious and beautiful country I had and shall have more opportunities to talk with Prime Minister Morarji Desai about the relations between our two countries and about the international situation. We think that both sides will have an identity of views on a series of questions of mutual concern. This identity of views will be a vivid expression of the friendship and multiform cooperation between our two peoples. As in the past, this friendship will always be as pure as a cloudless sky and this cooperation will unceasingly blossom and bear fruit.

Thank you for your attention.

Speaks at Delhi Banquet

BK2511.17Y Delhi ISI in English 0942 GMT 25 Feb 78 BK

[Speech by SRV Prime Minister Pham Van Dong at 24 February Delhi banquet hosted by Prime Minister Morarji Desai]

[Text] Your Excellency Prime Minister Morarji Desai, ladies and gentlemen,

I sincerely thank you Mr Prime Minister for your warm and profound feelings towards Vietnam and the Vietnamese people. I sincerely thank you and the Government of the Republic of India for having given me the opportunity to return after 23 years for a visit to this great country.

My previous visit left me deeply impressed by the Indian civilisation, one of mankind's oldest and most outstanding civilisations and by the big projects the Indian people were embarking on in their first 5-year plan after winning independence.

In my current visit, on behalf of the Vietnamese people who have won complete victory in their patriotic war, on behalf of the Government of unified and Socialist Vietnam, it gives me great joy to convey to the fraternal Indian people and the Government of the Republic of India friendly greetings and warm congratulations on the great achievements recorded by the Indian people since they became masters of their destiny more than 30 years ago. It is a great honour for me to have the opportunity this time to meet the leaders of India, and particularly you Mr Prime Minister, a disciple and comrade-in-arms of Mahatma Gandhi, that veteran statesman who worked all his life for the prosperity of India, that great friend of Vietnam and the architect of the friendship between our two countries.

Mr Prime Minister, our two peoples may be proud that the relations between Vietnam and India over the past 20 centuries have always been very pure relations, relations of peace and friendship. In the long years under colonial rule our two peoples encouraged each other in their struggle for national liberation till final victory. The drive for independence begun by Mahatma Gandhi in the 1920's aroused enthusiasm among Vietnamese patriots. Independent India, through the voices of Mahatma Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru, was at the side of the Vietnamese people from the first days of their war of resistance against the imperialist aggressors. The visit to Vietnam made by Indian leaders Jawaharlal Nehru, Sarvapathi Radakrishnan, Rajendra Prasad and visits to India made by our late President Ho Chi Minh and by myself constitute milestones in the unceasing development of friendship between our two peoples. The Vietnam-India joint communique signed by President Ho Chi Minh and Prime Minister Nehru 20 years ago affirmed the Indian people's support to the Vietnamese people in their struggle for independence, freedom and national reunification.

Following the Vietnamese people's complete victory, the Republic of India actively supported Vietnam's admission to the United Nations organisation and with other friendly countries sponsored the UN resolutions on reconstruction aid to Vietnam and proposed the creation of nonaligned movement funds to support Vietnam and [word indistinct]. India is wholeheartedly supporting and assisting us in many ways in the fields of agriculture, animal husbandry, industry, communications and transport, science and technology. We consider these as valuable contributions to healing the wounds of war and national construction in Vietnam. During my current visit many agreements--economic, cultural, scientific and technical--will be concluded, opening bright prospects for the multiform friendly cooperation between our two countries.

Mr Prime Minister, having the scourage of colonial domination in common, our two countries have to solve many difficult and complex problems left by the colonialist system in many areas. As with India, in the first days of its independence our country's pressing task is to eliminate the consequences of the colonialist regime, to build our economy rapidly, to catch up with developed countries and to bring our people a plentiful and happy life. We fully agree with the prime minister's words at the ministerial conference of the coordinating bureau of the nonaligned countries in New Delhi in April nineteen seventy-seven..."Our freedom would not be secure until the torch of freedom had been lit in so many lands which were under foreign rule." It is precisely because we share the same objectives and views that our two countries have united with each other and with other countries in the nonaligned movement, of which India is one of the initiators, in a common struggle to foil the schemes of imperialism, colonialism and neocolonialism, determined to regain the right to be masters politically and economically of our own destinies, to be masters of our natural resources and to build an independent and happy life for our people.

The friendly solidarity and cooperation between our two peoples will surely make a positive contribution to the growth of the nonaligned movement, to the cause of peace, national independence, democracy and social progress in this region and the world over.

With the belief that our current visit will open a new page in the fine relationship between our two countries, I would like to propose a toast: To the increasing consolidation and development of the friendship and cooperation between Vietnam and India, to the prosperity of the Republic of India, to the happiness of the Indian people, to the health of His Excellency President Sanjeeva Reddy, to the health of Your Excellency Prime Minister Morarji Desai, to the health of all our friends, ladies and gentlemen present here today.

Begins Talks With Desai

BK241319Y Delhi Domestic Service in English 1230 GMT 24 Feb 78 BK

[Text] Talks between the prime minister of India and Vietnam have begun in New Delhi.

Mr Morarji Desai and Mr Pham Van Dong were together for about 30 minutes without any aides. Later they were joined by the ministers of external affairs, agriculture, finance, railways, commerce and the minister of foreign trade and the vice minister of foreign affairs from the Vietnamese side.

Senior officials from both the sides are assisting in the talks.

Formal Talks Concluded

BK250902Y Delhi Domestic Service in English 0830 GMT 25 Feb 78 BK

[Text] India and Vietnam have agreed to cooperate in the fields of science and technology, agricultural research and trade and commerce. Formal agreements on these will be signed in New Delhi tomorrow. India has also agreed to provide a credit of nearly rupees 400 million to help Vietnam in the task of its economic reconstruction. This is the largest credit ever offered by India to any country.

The formal round of talks between the Vietnamese prime minister, Mr Pham Van Dong, and Mr Morarji Desai, which concluded in New Delhi today, have been described by official sources as very good and very impressive. There was virtually an identical approach on all subjects discussed. Mr Desai responded warmly to Vietnamese suggestions for cooperation in the field of agricultural development.

Earlier Mr Pham spoke at length of his country's internal situation and priorities of economic development. Vietnam considered the development of agriculture to be its most important and pressing task.

Mr Pham also explained his government's policy with regard to the unfortunate conflict with Cambodia. He expressed the confidence that the just cause will ultimately triumph.

Both the prime ministers were assisted by their full delegations. On the Indian side, the ministers for external affairs, commerce, agriculture, railways and finance were present. Mr Pham was assisted by his minister of foreign trade, vice minister of foreign affairs and other senior officials.

Earlier in the morning Mr Pham called on the vice president, Mr B.D. Jatti.

SUBSCRIPTION INFORMATION

DAILY REPORT volumes are published Monday through Friday in both paper version (mailed daily) and microfiche version (mailed weekly). Annual subscription including occasional supplements is, for the first volume, \$125 paper/\$100 fiche; each additional area volume up to seven, \$70 paper/\$60 fiche; all eight volumes \$575 paper/\$500 fiche. Foreign subscription for the first volume \$160 paper/\$125 fiche; each additional area volume up to seven, \$70 paper/\$60 fiche; all eight volumes for \$610 paper/\$525 fiche. Each additional paper or fiche subscription beyond eight is \$50. The volumes are: I—People's Republic of China; II—Eastern Europe; III—Soviet Union; IV—Asia & Pacific; V—Middle East & North Africa; VI—Latin America; VII—Western Europe; VIII—Sub-Saharan Africa. Back issues or single copies are not available. Allow 30 days for processing new subscriptions. Mail remittances, inquiries, and address changes to the NTIS address below.

Note: The publications of the Joint Publications Research Service (JPRS), which are sometimes cited in the DAILY REPORT, can also be ordered from NTIS in single copies or by subscription. In ordering, please cite the JPRS title, number, date, and author if applicable.

Both the DAILY REPORT and the JPRS publications are on file for public reference at the Library of Congress and at public and university libraries throughout the United States.

NTIS

National Technical Information Service
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Springfield, Virginia 22151